

INTERNAL STRUGGLE, INCOMPLETE FRAME?

RECONSIDERING TRITO-ISAIAH'S MESSAGE

A Dissertation

presented to

the Faculty of

Claremont School of Theology

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Naeyoun Cho

May 2022

© 2022 by Naeyoun Cho

All Rights Reserved



This dissertation completed by

NAEYOUN CHO

has been presented to and accepted by

the Faculty of the Claremont School of Theology

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty Committee

Dr. Marvin A. Sweeney, Chairperson

Dr. Jon L. Berquist

Dr. Kah-Jin Jeffrey Kuan

Dean of the Faculty

Dr. Andrew Dreitcer

May 2022

ABSTRACT

Internal Struggle, Incomplete Frame?

Reconsidering Trito-Isaiah's Message

Naeyoun Cho

There is no doubt that modern European biblical criticism contributes to opening gates for the critical reading of biblical texts both diachronically and synchronically. The problem with the premises of modern enlightenment ideas is that they too often trust coherent reason as long as it does not show any inconsistency. It is possible to find out in our reading of biblical texts. When we read and reconstruct the biblical texts which were written by ancient biblical authors and redactors, we expect logical coherence rather than incoherence. If we find logical incoherence, it is primarily considered to be the result of textual errors, different sources, and anachronism. What if those logical problems are not caused by historical anachronism, but by internal inconsistencies within the speaker/writer's mind? What if the speaker/writer has not enough logic and mental power to deliver one consistent message within his socio-political context? What if the surrounding nature of the speaker/writer is not as stable as we expect? Reconsidering Trito-Isaiah is a good example of a text that will allow us to analyze a situation in which an ancient speaker is struggling between established language and shifting environments. This thesis will navigate an anonymous man of transition with his incomplete frame in the late sixth century B.C.E.

Acknowledgments

This dissertation is part of ongoing journey to figure out biconceptuals within biblical texts. I know that this is just the starting point, not the end point. Even so, I would like to express my gratitude to those who have supported me in my journey. First of all, I wish to express my deep gratitude to my dissertation committee members. Dr. Marvin A. Sweeney, Dr. Jon L. Berquist, and Dr. Kah-Jin Jeffrey Kuan. Their profound insights into biblical texts made me navigate the ambivalence of Trito-Isaiah from various angles. Despite some inevitable difficulties because of the global pandemic, Claremont School of Theology has done its very best to support me. I would like to especially thank Sansu Woodmancy the registrar, Vicki Wiltse the dissertation thesis secretary, Maggie Froelich the theology librarian, Liz Butterfield the monograph and acquisitions manager at the Hatfield Library of Willamette University, and Genevieve Beenen, a freelance copy editor. I am very grateful for the Digital Theological Library. If this electronic service had not been available during the pandemic, I could not have accomplished this work. Also, I want to express my appreciation for those fine days with the excellent professors in Seoul Theological University and Graduate Theological Union: Dr. Hyeok-seung Kwon (rest in peace), Dr. Se Young Roh, Dr. Yong Ho Lee, Dr. Seong Hyuk Hong, Dr. MiYoung Im, Dr. Aaron Brody, Dr. Gina Hens-Piazza, Dr. Barbara Green, OP, and Dr. John Endres, SJ (rest in peace).

During my journey, there I have benefited from numerous financial and spiritual supporters. I would like to express my special thanks for the Study Abroad Scholarship Committee at Korean Evangelical Holiness Church. Also, I truly appreciated the Korean Endowment Fund at CST, Yooseon Scholarship Foundation, and Atlanta Bethel Church

Scholarship. I am also grateful for the endless prayers and encouragement from the Korean Evangelical Church of San Francisco and the Union Evangelical Church. Also, two additional institutes of higher education should be mentioned with deep gratitude: World Mission University and America Evangelical University.

I wish to dedicate my dissertation to my family. They have always been there for me in both good times and bad times. I have no words to adequately express my deepest gratitude for my dear father and mother, Rev. Chongkun Cho and Jaehee Song. My brother Wooyoun Cho, I really appreciate your encouragement every day. Also, my dear wife Rev. JungEun Park, I would like to thank you so much for supporting me every day with heartfelt love (Now it is your turn!).

All praise and glory to the Lord our God.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	v
List of Tables	xi
Abbreviations	xii
Introduction	1
Chapter One. Development of Form-Critical Method	4
<i>1.1. First Generation: A Short Speech Form and Its Setting</i>	<i>5</i>
1.1.1. Gunkel to Mowinckel in the Studies of Psalms	8
1.1.2. Gunkel to Westermann in the Studies on the Prophetic Literature	11
<i>1.2. Second Generation: The Large Literary Unit as the Product of Transmitting Tradition</i>	<i>15</i>
1.2.1. Albrecht Alt	15
1.2.2. Gerhard von Rad: Progression from the Short Credo to the Large Unit	17
1.2.3. Martin Noth: Deuteronomistic History as the Whole Literary Unit	22
<i>1.3. Third Generation: The Literary Structure of the Final Form</i>	<i>29</i>
1.3.1. Structuralism	29
1.3.2. Rhetorical Criticism	36
1.3.3. Narratology	41
<i>1.4. Fourth Generation: Intertextual Approaches</i>	<i>45</i>
1.4.1. The Poststructural Rediscovery of Mikhail Bakhtin	47
1.4.2. Mandolfo's Dialogic Form Criticism	53
<i>1.5. Closing Remarks</i>	<i>55</i>
Chapter Two. Redaction and Re-reading in Trito-Isaiah	57
<i>2.1. Dual Authorship Theory in Late 18th and Early 19th Centuries</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>2.2. Duhm's Tripartite Authorship</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>2.3. Reconsideration of Duhm's Theory in the First Half of the 20th Century</i>	<i>62</i>
2.3.1. Dependency on Previous Isaian Tradition	62
2.3.2. Dating of Trito-Isaiah	64
<i>2.4. Multiple Authorship and Dating of Trito-Isaiah until the 1970s</i>	<i>66</i>
2.4.1. 63:7-64:11; 60-62; 63:1-6	69
2.4.2. Chs. 56-59	71
2.4.3. Chs. 65-66	74
<i>2.5. Shift to Later Scribal Traditions</i>	<i>76</i>
2.5.1. Apocalyptic Scribal Tradition	78
2.5.2. Deuteronomistic Scribal Tradition	79

2.6. <i>Structural and Rhetorical Attention on Trito-Isaiah since Mid-20th Century</i>	81
2.6.1. Rhetorical	81
2.6.2. Structural	83
2.7. <i>Rising Attention on Synchronic Unity of the Final Form</i>	86
2.7.1. Inclusion of Chs. 65-66 and Ch. 1	86
2.7.2. Gap between Ch. 33 and Ch. 34	90
2.7.3. Back to the One-Author Theory?: The Debates around Evangelical Circle	96
2.8. <i>Reconsidering the Scope of Deutero-Isaiah</i>	102
2.8.1. Single Authorship of Chs. 40-66	102
2.8.2. Scribal Tradents Continuing Previous Traditions	107
2.9. <i>Revisiting Redactions of Trito-Isaiah</i>	113
2.10. <i>Closing Remarks</i>	126
Chapter Three. Methodology for Reading Biconceptuals in Trito-Isaiah	129
3.1. <i>Collective Memory</i>	130
3.2. <i>Interpretive Communities</i>	148
3.3. <i>Conceptual Metaphor</i>	163
3.4. <i>The Problem of Ambivalence in Reality</i>	180
3.5. <i>Closing Remarks</i>	200
Chapter Four. Socio-Historical Reconstruction of Persian Yehud	202
4.1. <i>Cyrus II (r. 560-530)</i>	204
4.1.1. Early Life	204
4.1.2. Conquest of Babylon in 539	206
4.1.3. Sheshbazzar and the Role of Babylon Exiles	208
4.1.4. Diasporic Problems and the Myth of Empty Land	210
4.1.5. Cyrus's Imperialism	212
4.2. <i>Cambyzes II (r. 530-522)</i>	213
4.2.1. Cambyzes in Egypt	213
4.2.2. Udjahorresnet	215
4.2.3. Internal Crisis in 522	217
4.3. <i>Darius I (r. 522-486)</i>	218
4.3.1. Darius and the Dynastic Problems	219
4.3.2. Six Liar Kings	222
4.3.3. Zerubbabel Problem	224
4.3.4. Infrastructural Effort	231
4.4. <i>Xerxes I (r. 486-465)</i>	235
4.4.1. Expeditions against Attica and Peloponnesus Regions	235
4.4.2. Satrapal Reorganization	236

4.5. <i>Artaxerxes I (r. 465-424)</i>	238
4.5.1. Dynastic Problems	238
4.5.2. The Revolt of Inaros, Peace of Callias and Aftermath	238
4.5.3. Myth of Mass Return	242
4.5.4. Dependency of Yehud upon Samaritan Administration?	243
4.5.5. Elephantine at Syene	247
4.5.6. Theocratic Yehud?	248
4.5.7. Ezra and Nehemiah	250
4.6. <i>Reconstructing Social Setting of Trito-Isaiah</i>	252
4.6.1. Two Priestly Groups: Enfranchised v. Disenfranchised (Plöger-Hanson)	252
4.6.2. Three Priestly Groups (Cook's revision)	254
4.6.3. Two Religious Groups	
: Yahwistic Separatists and Syncretic Assimilationists (Smith-Schramm)	256
4.6.4. Class Mobility	
: <i>Haredim</i> from Disfranchised to Enfranchised (Blenkinsopp's revision)	260
4.6.5. Two Geo-religious Groups	
: Judahites Criticism against Exilic Leadership (Tiemeyer's revision)	262
4.6.6. Three Social Groups	
: Immigrants' (Politicians, Priests) Interplays against Yehud Natives (Berquist)	265
4.7. <i>Closing Remarks</i>	268
Chapter Five. Prophetic Self-Awareness in Monologic Core (61:1-62:12)	271
5.1. <i>Exegesis</i>	271
5.1.1. 61:1-6 Inauguration and Commission	271
5.1.2. 61:7-9 Announcement of Salvation for People	282
5.1.3. 61:10-11 Praise of Rejoicing	285
5.1.4. 62:1 Pledge for Jerusalem	287
5.1.5. 62:2-5 Glorification of <i>Bat Zion</i>	287
5.1.6. 62:6-7 Appointment of Watchmen in Jerusalem	291
5.1.7. 62:8-9 Announcement Divine Oath	293
5.1.8. 62:10-12 Announcement of Salvation for <i>Bat Zion</i>	296
5.2. <i>Closing Remarks</i>	298
Chapter Six. Prophetic Announcement to Pious Audience in 56:1-8	300
6.1. <i>Exegesis</i>	300
6.1.1. 56:1-3 Instruction and Beatitude	300
6.1.2. 56:4-7 Promise	311
6.1.3. 56:8 Oracle	318
6.2. <i>Closing Remarks</i>	319

Chapter Seven. Prophetic Announcement to Pious Audience in 66:1-24	321
<i>7.1. Exegesis</i>	<i>321</i>
7.1.1. 66:1-4 Announcement of Restoration of the Trembler and Judgment against the Wicked	321
7.1.2. 66:7-18aa New Birth of People by Zion	329
7.1.3. 66:18ab-21 Announcement of Restoration and Following Divine Actions	335
7.1.4. 66:22-24 New Creation with Judgment	347
<i>7.2. Closing Remarks</i>	<i>349</i>
Conclusion	352
Bibliography	355

List of Tables

Table 1. Various Dating of Chs. 60-62, 63-64 until the 1970s	69
Table 2. Various Dating of Chs. 56-59 until the 1970s	71
Table 3. Various Dating of Chs. 65-66 until the 1970s	74
Table 4. Bonnard's Chiastic Demarcation	84
Table 5. Brownlee's Bisectonal Structure of Two Volumes of Isaiah	93
Table 6. Six Redactional Proposals by Scholars after the Late 1980s	115
Table 7. The Four Groups of the Wicked in 66:3a	324

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
AJSL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature</i>
Ant.	Flavius Josephus' <i>Antiquities of the Jews</i>
ATJ	<i>Ashland Theological Journal</i>
ASR	<i>American Sociological Review</i>
AYBRL	Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
BA	<i>Biblical Archeologist</i>
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BibInt	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBR	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
ECC	Eerdmans Critical Commentary
EOTS	<i>Evangelical Old Testament Studies</i>

<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature Series
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
<i>Hdt.</i>	Heroduts' <i>Histories</i>
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>IB</i>	<i>The Interpreter's Bible</i> . Edited by G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1962.
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
<i>IBDSup</i>	<i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> , Supplementary Volume. Edited by K. Crim. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1976.
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>ISBE</i>	<i>International Standard Bible Encyclopedia</i> . Edited by G. W. Bromiley. 4 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979-1988.
<i>JANESCU</i>	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
<i>JARCE</i>	<i>Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>

<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i>
<i>JRC</i>	<i>Journal of Religion and Culture</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series
<i>JSQ</i>	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
KAT	Kommentar Zum Alten Testament
KHAT	Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament
<i>KJCS</i>	<i>Korean Journal of Christian Studies</i>
<i>KJOTS</i>	<i>Korean Journal of Old Testament Studies</i>
LCBI	Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
<i>MTSR</i>	<i>Method and Theory in the Study of Religion.</i>
NAC	New American Commentary
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary Series
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NKZ</i>	<i>Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift</i>
<i>Numen</i>	<i>NVMEN: International Review for the History of Religions</i>
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies

<i>PLMA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Modern Language Association of America</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
<i>RGG</i>	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> . 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1927-1932.
<i>SBibT</i>	<i>Studia Biblica et Theologica</i>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph-Series
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
TBS	Tools for Biblical Study
<i>TDOT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, and D. E. Green. 15 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1974-2006.
<i>ThLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>ThViat</i>	<i>Theologia Viatorum</i>
<i>TOB</i>	<i>La Traduction OEcuménique de la Bible</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WBC	World Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament

<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
<i>WZ(H)</i>	<i>Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

Introduction

Since Bernhard Duhm calls Isaiah chapters 56 to 66 as Trito-Isaiah, there are various theories to define what Trito-Isaiah really is.¹ With deep respect and honor for previous scholars, I will focus on how the ancient reader of the interpretive community used the given and inherited language to express his thoughts to his target audience. The recent socio-cultural theories on collective memory and interpretive communities provide essential insights into how the actual reader inherits and interprets the text. Trito-Isaiah, as one who inherited a legacy from ancestors of exilic parents and even before, could be identified as one who shares the communal memory of a particular interpretive community. Thus, I will apply the term Trito-Isaiah to an anonymous speaker within the final form of chapters 56-66.² At this point, we need to think about the thematic inconsistencies within chapters 56-66. Many scholars deal with the problem of thematic inconsistencies by regarding them as textual or compositional issues. The basis for this reasoning is that the author should be logically consistent. However, this presumption is too idealistic if we apply this to the ancient text. As George Lakoff and Mark Johnson suggest, there is no such thing as a Cartesian reason, but the real reason resides within human's embodied and cultural experience.³ So, it is necessary to change our perspective and reconsider who the ancient reader was, particularly concerning Trito-Isaiah. This will be the starting point to resolve the problem of

¹ Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, 2nd ed., HKAT III, 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902), xiii.

² The compositional stage of the final form of Trito-Isaiah would overlap with that of the final form of the Book of Isaiah. However, this thesis limits its interests to investigating why the final form of Trito-Isaiah contains contradictory messages of the anonymous speaker/writer.

³ George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 192-93. The first edition was published in 1980. To read more, see George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought* (New York: Basic Books, 1999).

ambivalence within Trito-Isaiah, particularly between the core (61:1-62:12) and the bookends (56:1-8; 66:1-24). Therefore, I will demonstrate that Trito-Isaiah was an anonymous man of transition with his incomplete frames within the unstable socio-political situation in the late sixth century B.C.E.

The outline of this dissertation is as follows. Chapter One will present an overview of the development of form criticism. This history of form criticism is pervasive, so it is hard to define in one statement. Instead, I will divide its history into four generations, after which recent trends of form criticism are introduced and accepted. This part provides the grounding basis for the exegesis of Chapters Five to Seven. Chapter Two will review the history of Trito-Isaiah scholarship, especially concerning redaction issues. This review is necessary since it is impossible to detach compositional issues from the discussion of Trito-Isaiah. Since our purpose is to focus on the psychology of an anonymous speaker of the final form of Trito-Isaiah, the compositional issues are only reviewed in this chapter. Chapter Three is the key part of this dissertation since it provides the theoretical foundations that allow us to navigate and analyze the biconceptualism of Trito-Isaiah. Here I will introduce four different socio-cultural and literary theories: 1) collective memory; 2) interpretive communities; 3) conceptual metaphors; and 4) ambivalence in reality. Even though these theories originated from different disciplines, they provide significant insights into reconstructing the ancient readers living within their embodied and cultural experiences. Then, Chapter Four will review historical issues regarding the Persian Empire and Yehud from the reign of Cyrus II to Artaxerxes I. By examining how historians and biblical scholars reconstruct ancient Persian history, we will decide our direction of reading

Trito-Isaiah. Along with this, the end of this chapter will provide a review of how Isaian scholars reconstruct the social setting of Trito-Isaiah. The last three chapters (Chapter Five, Six, and Seven) will be the exegesis of the core (61:1-62:12) and the bookends (56:1-8 and 66:1-24). The scope of the exegesis is limited to the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS). The Conclusion will summarize these findings.

Chapter One

Development of the Form-Critical Method

Form criticism has become an accepted exegetical tool, included in many textbooks, despite a history of debate within the field. The pros and cons of this method have long been discussed within the field. The method is frequently critiqued as too focused on the short, self-contained forms of a particular setting. However, this definition is too dismissive of what has happened in later times. As we know, one present event does not emerge without any relationship with its past. All methods or criticisms in post/modern scholarship are considered as the dialogical process of the past and the present, and even of the future. If we turn our attention to literature, this dialogical relationship is also found in the dynamics that arise between the author, the text, and the reader. The development of form criticism also should be understood in this way. Nothing comes out of the void.

Within a century, this method has been challenged, modified, reorganized and even expanded in various ways by succeeding scholars. The pioneers and successors of this method, no matter how they were utilizing and reshaping it, had been rooted in Hermann Gunkel's basic thought by which he ventured to find the origins of the genre and its institutional setting. Gunkel's primary idea on form and genre was groundbreaking in the existing academic environment which had a tendency to dig into biblical literature within the German context of the early twentieth century. The classical Gunkelian form criticism was more interested in discovering and identifying how the earlier form of short speech was delivered in particular

settings and how it had been transmitted (*Sitz im Leben*). However, as Martin Buss pointed out, this is too particularistic since it does not much care about the relational traits of biblical texts. For these reasons, post-Gunkelian form criticism has been more interested in how this short speech form has been developed, expanded, and finalized into the large textual unit or structure and even into the final form (*Sitz im Literatur*). This tendency is already found after James Muilenburg and Rolf P. Knierim's discussions on how to shape the next generation beyond the concept of the short, self-contained form.

In this chapter, I will divide the development of form criticism into four generations. The first generation is about the classical understanding of form and genre that is suggested by Gunkel. The second part is about how scholars expand the understanding of form and genre into the larger text unit in relation to the concept of tradition and transmission. The third generation is related to the revolutionary shift from diachronic to synchronic aspects of the text. Finally, the fourth generation shows how recent scholars are making an effort to create a bridge between the past and the present, also between the author, the text, and the reader.

1.1. First Generation: A Short Speech Form and Its Setting

Gunkel's method is called "*Formgeschichte*."¹ This German nomenclature shows the primary purpose of Gunkelian analysis. This method presupposes that the short-speech form would be a fundamental unit to reconstruct the history of the composition of biblical literature. Gunkel is problematizing the research tendency to focus only on written texts, which are

¹ This term is used by Gunkel's student, Martin Dibelius. Samuel Byrskog, "Form Criticism," in *The Dictionary of the Bible and Ancient Media*. ed. Tom Tcher et al. (New York: T&T Clark, 2017), 142.

represented as classical literary criticism (known as source criticism during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries). At that time, his contemporaries were more concerned with identifying individual documents which functioned as source texts within current texts. The documentary analysis has been developed in the field of Pentateuch/Torah studies. Whether or not each source text emerged independently (fragmentary) or dependently (supplementary); whether or not when and where these source texts were composed in the course of the history of religion (*Geschichte der Religion*);² whether or not how source texts were interconnected and combined as the one textual form—this analysis did not adequately take care of the pre-textual stages of the composition.³ That flowed from a tendency to believe that history would be a matter of only the recorded past. As Jean Louis Ska mentioned, the biblical scholarship from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century was influenced by Leopold von Ranke's (1795-1886) approach to history as *Wissenschaft* (objective science/knowledge researching for what happened in the past).

The investigation, according to von Ranke, must be based on the records of eye-witnesses and first-hand documents. Contrary to Michelet and Thierry, von Ranke always preferred to present facts in a strictly objective way, even at the cost of unattractiveness...In spite of this, von Ranke was rather conservative. As his master Thucydides did, he emphasized political history, focusing more on the deeds of kings and leaders than on social and economic factors. His basic attitude

² The *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* in the late nineteenth century viewed religion in a comparative sense. They compared the ancient Israel religion with the ancient Near Eastern one for tracking the original form of it from history. However, the term *religion* was defined in the limited sense. For example, according to Tomoko Masuzawa, the term *religion* meant the universal monotheistic traditions in Europe, so it was used as the limited taxonomy. Even later, in the nineteenth century, Europeans made a distinction between Aryan religion (Christianity, Buddhism) and the Semitic religion (Judaism, Islam) as a result of the eugenics movement. See Tomoko Masuzawa, *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); Ryan Anningson, "Once the Buddha Was an Aryan: Race Sciences and the Domestication of Buddhism in North America," *JRC* 27.1 (2017): 57-76.

³ Diane Nunn Banks, *Writing the History of Israel*, LHBOTS 438 (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 133.

was also nationalistic...Acclaimed as “the greatest German historian”, von Ranke had a strong influence, although less direct than indirect, on biblical studies.⁴

However, even though Gunkel was baptized by the history of religion school, he was more interested in the pre-textual elements than in the written sources. Influenced by the Grimm brothers, the folkloric contents in the compositional history of biblical literature became an important matter. As Stefan Berge mentions, since Ranke’s approach focuses on the authenticity of national cultures while rejecting Enlightenment’s universalism, it encouraged folklore studies.⁵ Because collecting rural folklore was related to establishing a national identity as a whole, the folklore studies paid more attention to verbal/oral transmission than to the written record.

Likewise, the study of verbal testimonials of folklore became part of the academic establishment of German literature studies and also, to an extent, of history, which had gradually gained preeminence in German humanities or *Geistwissenschaften*. Particularly after Leopold von Ranke established the historiographic and historicist school of writing history, this field superseded philosophy to become the dominant force in the *Geistwissenschaften* throughout the nineteenth century and thereafter.⁶

Therefore, Gunkel’s analysis reflected this tendency in the early twentieth century in German humanities. Gunkel tried to find how the short speech forms had been delivered within particular *Sitz im Leben* (life settings) and transmitted throughout the entire history of ancient

⁴ Jean Louis Ska, “The ‘History of Israel’: Its Emergence as an Independent Discipline,” in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 3.1: 312.

⁵ Stefan Berge, “The Invention of European National Traditions in European Romanticism,” in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, ed. Daniel Woolf, vol. 4, 1800-1945, ed. Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maiguashca, and Attila Pók (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 23.

⁶ Andre Gingrich, “The German-Speaking Countries,” in *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and American Anthropology*, ed. Fredrik Barth, Andre Gingrich, Robert Parkin, and Sydel Silverman (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2005), 77.

Israel. In his 1895 commentary on the Book of Genesis and Revelation, he discussed the *Chaoskampf* motif throughout, comparing both biblical and ancient Near Eastern literature.⁷ Also, in his commentary on Genesis (1901), he identified its literary characteristics (*Gattung*; genre) as *Sagen* (mythological, patriarchal, heroic, ethnographic, aetiological).⁸

1.1.1. Gunkel to Mowinckel in the Studies of Psalms

Gunkel's genre analysis (*Gattungsforschung*) was developed in his commentary on the Book of Psalms (1926) and another work completed by J. Begrich (1933). He classified the genres of the Psalms into five major categories (*Hauptgattungen*)⁹ with other minor categories (*Kleinere Gattungen*).¹⁰ These minor categories do not appear a lot in the Book of Psalms.¹¹

⁷ Hermann Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation*. trans. K. William Whitney Jr. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006). The original German edition is, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895). See also, John Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985); David Toshio Tsumura, *Creation and Destruction: A Reappraisal of the Chaoskampf Theory in the Old Testament* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005); JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, eds., *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaoskampf Hypothesis* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013); Paul K. -K. Cho, *Myth, History, and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2019).

⁸ R. Kroeger said, "Regrettably, the English translator of Gunkel's work consistently used "legend" to render Gunkel's *Sagen*." See, R. Kroeger, "Legend" in *ISBE*, Revised ed., vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986), 101. Timothy D. Finlay also differentiated the *legende* and the *Saga*; "The *legende* is therefore more oriented toward edification whereas the *Sage* is oriented toward entertainment." See, footnote 20 from Timothy D. Finlay, *The Birth Report Genre in the Hebrew Bible*, *FAT* 2.12 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 5. For more readings, John William Rogerson, *Myth in Old Testament Interpretation*, *BZAW* 134 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1974), 61; John H. Hayes, *Old Testament Form Criticism* (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974), 61, 81.

⁹ 1) hymns (including songs of Zion, enthronement psalms); 2) communal laments; 3) royal psalms; 4) individual laments; and 5) individual songs of thanksgiving.

¹⁰ Songs of pilgrimage (Ps 84, 122), Communal songs of thanksgiving (Ps 67, 124), wisdom poetry, Torah liturgies, Prophetic liturgies, mixed poems. See more, Leopold Sabourin S.J., *The Psalms: Their Origin and Meaning* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2010; Originally published in 1974).

Each genre has its own particular life setting in the life of ancient Israelites (religious cult and festival, royal court, war, pilgrimage, convocation, school, family, personal life events).

Sigmund Mowinckel, a student of Gunkel, was of the opinion that the psalms were the product of one particular setting. Following the Myth and Ritual School in Scandinavia (I. Engnell) and England (S. H. Hooke, James Frazer),¹² he presumed that the Israelites were reciting psalms and performing rituals in the specific religious festivals when people were making a pilgrimage to the First Temple. Mowinckel observed that the *Sitz im Leben* in Psalms 47, 93, 96-99 was similar to the Babylonian New Year Festival (*akitu*). This festival took place in the spring and described the divine coronation to celebrate the victory of Marduk over Tiamat. By comparing the *Chaoskampf* motif in the *Enuma Elish* and biblical accounts, he suggested that these psalms could be considered the enthronement psalms that were sung to celebrate YHWH's victory over the chaotic force (*tehom*) at the beginning of the New Year Festival in autumn, according to the ancient Israelite calendar. He thus linked ancient divine enthronement rites with

¹¹ Hermann Gunkel, *An Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*. Completed by Joachim Begrich, trans. James D. Nogalski (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998), 9f. The original German edition is *Die Psalmen*, HKAT II, 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926).

¹² However, Mowinckel was criticized by Myth and Ritual school in Scandinavia and England both. "Mowinckel was critical of what he viewed as excesses in the myth and ritual school, especially the tendency to overlook the differences between different ancient Near Eastern cultures, and Engnell's idea that the king in ancient Israel was divine. Hooke, a leading scholar of the myth and ritual school, accused Mowinckel of "like Saturn, devouring his own children." But Mowinckel's insistence on the distinctiveness of Israel was closer to the mainstream, theological, scholarship of his time than were the more radical history of religions scholars such as Hooke and Engnell." See, John J. Collins "Mowinckel's He That Cometh in retrospect" in Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*. trans. G. W. Anderson (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1954), xvii. The original German edition is *Han som kommer: Messiasforventningen i Det gamle testament og på Jesu tid* (København: G. E. C. Gads forlag, 1951); Ivan Engnell, "New Year Festivals" in *The Myth and Ritual Theory: An Anthology*. ed. Robert A. Segal (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), 136-140.

the Israelite fall festival sequence from Rosh HaShanah through Sukkot¹³ which were interrelated with rites of divine enthronement.¹⁴ This cult-historical approach was also applied to reconstructing the *Sitz im Leben* of the prophetic oracles.¹⁵ Mowinckel was paying attention to the relationship between the oracle of the seer-prophet and the instruction (*torah*) of the priest.¹⁶

Artur Weiser admitted the foreign influences on ancient Israelite religions, but he objected to Mowinckel's proposal of the New Year Festival because of the lack of biblical evidence. Instead, following von Rad's opinion, Weiser put the enthronement psalms within the cultic setting of the covenant festival.¹⁷ However, as Leo G. Perdue noted, the criticism of the lack of biblical evidence "fails to discredit Mowinckel's thesis, since he indicates that the enthronement ceremony was only one component of the larger Feast of Tabernacles."¹⁸ Although it might imply Sukkot, Mowinckel's theory is dependent upon the Mesopotamian context rather than the Canaanite one. Mowinckel had no opportunities to access the Ugaritic sources later

¹³ On more detailed information of Sukkot from the ancient time to the Rabbinic, read, Jeffrey L. Rubenstein, *The History of Sukkot in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods*, BJS 302 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2020. Originally published in 1985).

¹⁴ Marvin A. Sweeney focuses on why Jeroboam ben Nebat was condemned by the Josianic DtrH because of his reinstitution of Sukkot at Beth-El from the seventh month to the eighth. Sweeney, *I & II Kings: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 179. Kevin Tolley read the servant songs in the Deutero-Isaiah within the liturgical setting of Sukkot. See, Tolley, *Deutero-Isaiah's Servant in Light of Ritual and Temple Imagery* (PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2019).

¹⁵ John H. Hayes, "The History of the Form-Critical Study of Prophecy" in *Interpreting Ancient Israelite History, Prophecy, and Law*. ed. Brad E. Kelle (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017), 194-201. Originally published in 1973.

¹⁶ Sigmund Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition* (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1946), 101-2.

¹⁷ Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary*, OTL. trans. Herbert Hartwell (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962; translation of the fourth edition in German, 1955), 53-54, 62-63. Kraus criticized Mowinckel and Weiser's postulation because of its generalization to various cultic traditions in ancient Israel. See Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament*. trans. Geoffrey Buswell (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966; originally published in German, 1962), 208-9.

¹⁸ Leo G. Perdue, "Yahweh Is King over All the Earth: An Exegesis of Psalm 47" *Restoration Quarterly* 17.3 (1974), 88. (footnote 12).

discovered. For this reason, several scholars began to reconsider his theory.¹⁹ David Toshio Tsumura argues that the direct connection between *tehom* in the Hebrew creation story and *Tiamat* in *Enuma Elish* is not established.²⁰ As Ki-Min Bang points out, the Israelite fall festivals are related to the eastern Mediterranean climate, not the Mesopotamian one.²¹ Martin Rösel even points out that Mowinckel's cult-historical method "can no longer be justified."²² Nevertheless, although there are many theoretical weaknesses, Mowinckel's insight to link the *Sitz im Leben* of prophetic oracles to Israelite liturgy opened new avenues of interpretation.²³

1.1.2. Gunkel to Westermann in the Studies on the Prophetic Literature

Gunkel's form-critical theories connect the prophetic act of hearing with oral cultures. He noted that the ancient prophets "were not originally writers but speakers."²⁴ The ecstatic experience (divine possession) would be regarded as fundamental for receiving the divine

¹⁹ Allan Rosengren Petersen criticized this. Peterson, *The Royal God: Enthronement Festivals in Ancient Israel and Ugarit?*, JSOTSup 259 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 26-33. See also, Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, trans. John McHugh (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1961), 502-06. First published in French, 1958-1960; Marc Zvi Brettler, *God Is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor*, LHBOTS 76 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2009), 157-58. Anne Moore, *Moving Beyond Symbol and Myth: Understanding the Kingship of God of the Hebrew Bible Through Metaphor* (New York: Peter Lang, 2009), 74.

²⁰ Tsumura, *Creation and Destruction*, 36-57.

²¹ Ki-Min Bang, *The Combat Myth Motif in Psalm 89: Redaction Historical and Environmental Analyses* (PhD diss., Lutheran School of Theology, 2020), 55-6.

²² Martin Rösel, "Inscriptional Evidence and the Question of Genre," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 107-8.

²³ Recent research on the ancient Israelite ritual and worship, see, Samuel E. Balentine, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Ritual and Worship in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020).

²⁴ Hermann Gunkel, "The Prophet as Writers and Poets," in *Prophecy in Israel: Search for an Identity*, trans. J. L. Schaaf, ed. David L. Petersen (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 24.

(supernatural) revelation.²⁵ The earlier unnamed prophets who encountered Saul (1Sam 10:5-13) are an excellent first example of ecstatic prophecy, making the earliest prophets ‘foretellers of the future.’²⁶

Gunkel admitted that, with the historical development of writing skills, prophets were gradually starting to write down what they delivered (Isa 10:1; Jer 36). But he did not mean that the present form of the book would be the work of the prophet himself. Rather, the “history of growth of the prophetic books belongs together with the history of the gradual development of the individual units of which they are composed.”²⁷ Therefore, he delineated three prophetic speeches: 1) shortest speech units; 2) longer speeches; and 3) entire books.

His differentiation between the threat (*Drohrede*) and the reproach (*Scheltrede*) was based on the reasons discussed above. As John H. Hayes points out, Gunkel considers a promise (*Verheissung*) and a threat (*Droh*) as the earliest prophetic speech form, although he did not elaborate on this point.²⁸ Logically, this prophetic speech form is related to the prophet as the messenger of the divine revelation. Therefore, it is delivered via a typical messenger formula like “Thus says the Lord (*ko ‘amar yhwh*)” and the oracle formula “says the Lord (*neum yhwh*)” in

²⁵ Robert R. Wilson reevaluated prophetic ecstasy about form-critical and anthropological methods. He understood this term as a process of divine-human communication, not just as a type of behavior. Concerning the case of spiritual possession, he was distinguishing this behavior into two categories, trance or non-trance behavior. Depending on how society dealt with this phenomenon, the prophetic speech patterns and their behavior were standardized in public as classical form critics had suggested on typicality. However, it has also changed over time and varied depending on spaces. Therefore, Wilson’s approach on ecstasy is more delving into the issues of *Sitz im Leben* of ancient Israelites prophetic speeches and their uniqueness. See, Robert R. Wilson, “Prophecy and Ecstasy: A Reexamination” *JBL* 98.3 (1979), 321-337.

²⁶ Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 16; Hayes, *Interpreting Ancient Israelite*, 97.

²⁷ Gunkel. “The Prophet as Writers and Poets,” 29.

²⁸ Hayes, *Interpreting Ancient Israelite*, 100.

which YHWH is addressed in the third person.²⁹ On that basis, the prophetic role was not only to deliver the divine messenger but also to begin “to give the ethical reason why what they prophesied had to come to pass.”³⁰ This later development of prophetic speech is called the reproach as a reasoning part of the threat. Hugo Gressmann and Emil Balla also developed a supplementary role of reproach on the threat.³¹

Claus Westermann criticized Gunkel’s supplementary but asynchronous view on the prophetic messenger speech. He argued that both threat and reproach are found in prophetic texts, “not as two separate genres, but as one speech form, i.e., as two constituent parts or members of one speech forms the prophetic judgment-speech.”³² Therefore, he suggested synchrony of threat and reproach within prophetic speech as one single unit and event.

Westermann proposed a more extended unit as a basic form of prophetic speech form. He identified three stages of prophetic speech.³³ The first, accounts, are primarily historical narratives. He considered Jonah to be an exception, labeling it ‘pre-classical’. His second stage, prophetic speeches, had three components that were dependent upon thematic value. This would be distinguished into the announcement of judgment (what Gunkel called as ‘threat’) with the accusation (what Gunkel called as ‘reproach’) and the announcement of salvation. Westermann

²⁹ Hermann Gunkel, “The Israelite Prophecy from the Time of Amos,” in *Twentieth Century Theology in the Making: Themes of Biblical Theology*. ed. Jaroslav Pelikan, trans. R. A. Wilson (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 67-68. This is an excerpt from *RGG*, Second edition (1927-32).

³⁰ Gunkel, “Amos,” 74.

³¹ Hugo Gressmann, *Die Älteste Geschichtsschreibung Und Prophetie Israels* (1910); Emil Balla, *Die Droh- und Scheltworte des Amos* (1926).

³² Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, trans. Hugh Clayton White (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1967), 30. Original German edition is *Grundformen Prophetischer Rede* in 1964.

³³ Westermann, *Basic Forms*, 90-91. Bill T. Arnold summarizes Westermann’s theory as the diagram. See, Bill T. Arnold, “Forms of Prophetic Speech in the Old Testament: A Summary of Claus Westermann’s Contributions” *ATJ* 27 (1995), 32.

considered that the first one is prior to the latter.–Further, concerning audiences/addressee, the judgment against an individual (JI) would be made prior to one against nations (JN). The last one refers to utterances such as laments and praises.

Like Gunkel, Westermann identified the prophet as the messenger, that is: as the one whose voice delivered the divine revelation to audiences and explained it. The messenger formula like the particle *al-ken* or *la-ken* (therefore) and phrase *ko amar adonai* (thus says the Lord) functioned to introduce an announcement of judgment when the prophet as the messenger was delivering the divine revelation to audiences. He compared the biblical prophetic speech with the prophetic speech in the Mari texts in the eighteenth century B.C.E. to strengthen his argument.³⁴ A modern critique of Westermann has been voiced by Hayes:

...Westermann (*Basic Forms*, 29–30) seems to me to have completely misrepresented Gunkel's treatment of the threat and reproach. He claims that Gunkel considered the reproach a borrowed form. Gunkel did not; he considered it instead as an inner prophetic development utilized to undergird or explain the threat. Westermann claims that Gunkel considered the two as independent and separate genres. Gunkel did not; he considered them closely bound together.³⁵

Hayes's criticism of Westermann is plausible at first glance. Previous scholarship like Gunkel, Gressman, and Ball regarded the roles between threat and reproach to be interdependent. They thought the latter would be supplementary to the former. Yes, Westermann was also following that line. What he was problematizing was asynchronous approaches on two forms. By doing this, Westermann's observation opens the gate to seeing larger forms and structures in biblical texts, rather than only short ones.

³⁴ Westermann, *Basic Forms*, 115-128.

³⁵ Hayes, *Interpreting Ancient Israelite*, 118-9. Though he never mentioned Westermann in his text, he was criticizing him in his postscript (endnote 85).

1.2. Second Generation: The Large Literary Unit as the Product of Transmitting Tradition

Before Westermann published *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* in 1946, scholars had already begun to turn their eyes toward the history of tradition. Gunkel's emphasis on the oral history behind the text requires scholars to consider how the ancient traditions were transmitted in history. So, at first, as was true with Gunkelian form-criticism, the main interest of tradition-history was its orality rather than literary. In other words, just like source and form criticism earlier, the task of tradition-history was to dig into earlier forms of tradition.

1.2.1. Albrecht Alt

The methodology of Gerhard von Rad and Martin Noth began from form-critical attention to the text, although both are considered pioneers of tradition-historical criticism or redaction criticism.³⁶ Both were students of Albrecht Alt, who was interested in reevaluating the religious life of the ancient Israelites as the semi-nomadic clan, or tribe, in the land of Canaan before the formation of the monarchy. This attempt is well described in Alt's discussion on the settlement of ancient Israel.³⁷ Unlike the Albrightian school (the biblical archeology school; Albright-Wright-Bright) in the United States was making efforts to find archeological evidence of a biblical conquest narrative, the Alt-Noth school in Germany was considering the idea that the settlement was infiltrated peacefully by the coexistence of semi-nomadic immigrants and

³⁶ Klaus Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method*, trans. S. M. Cupitt (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969), 64-66; John Van Seters, *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the Editor in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 269.

³⁷ Albrecht Alt, "The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine," in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. R. A. Willson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966), 173-222. Originally published in German, 1925.

native settlers.³⁸ However, both schools in the early twentieth century had more maximalist positions than later minimalist historians or archeologists.

Also, this idea is developed in Alt's later discussions. In his article "God of the Fathers" (*Die Gott der Vater*), he presupposed that pre-Mosaic religion shared religious concepts with ancient Canaanites. Its practice did not cling to patriarchs themselves. Rather, because of their semi-nomadic life, practices came from specific cultic locations and deity names.³⁹ These ideas shaped his form-critical analysis of legal expressions and led to two primary legal forms. The first is casuistic law (case law), which begins with the protasis form of 'if/then' in conditional command. The other is apodictic law (absolute law, categorical law, normative law), which contains more general nuances of command with the form of 'thou shall not.' He presupposed that casuistic law came into Israelite practice through exposure to Canaanite systems. Simultaneously, the second originated from ancient Israelites' unique context as semi-nomadic (i.e., the Decalogue, the curse law, the murder law) within the covenant festival in Shechem. The hybrid form of both (If..., then you shall do...) shows how ancient Israelites were in communities with Canaanites after the settlement.

Though the apodictic law was considered the unique form/style in the ancient Israelites' legal speech and its setting, as Moshe Weinfeld pointed out, this form is also found in the Hittite

³⁸ The theories of the origin of ancient Israelites are various. John J. Bimson, "The Origins of Israel in Canaan: An Examination of Recent Theories," *Themelios* 15.1 (1989): 4-15; Megan Bishop Moore, *Philosophy and Practice in Writing a History of Ancient Israel*, LHBOTS 435 (New York: T&T Clark, 2006); Megan Bishop Moore and Brad E. Kelle, *Biblical History and Israel's Past: The Changing Study of the Bible and History* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011); David M. Howard Jr. and Michael A. Grisanti, eds., *Giving the Sense: Understanding and Using Old Testament Historical Texts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2003).

³⁹ Albrecht Alt, "The God of the Fathers," in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. R. A. Willson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966), 1-86. Originally published in German, 1929.

and Assyrian legal instructions.⁴⁰ In a similar vein, scholars such as George E. Mendenhall, Raymond Westbrook, and Johnson M. Kimuhu also questioned the uniqueness of the biblical apodictic law within the ancient Near Eastern context.⁴¹ Rifat Sonsino problematized the anachronistic usage of the ‘apodictic’ in biblical law.⁴² Instead, based on the syntactic structure of apodictic forms, Sonsino suggested the alternative categories of ‘conditional’ and ‘unconditional’.⁴³ However, as Westbrook mentions, Alt’s classification of two legal forms appears to be “somehow different in source and content.”⁴⁴

1.2.2. Gerhard von Rad: Progression from the Short Credo to the Large Unit

Following Alt’s view, Gerhard von Rad was focused on the conclusive function of the settlement tradition (*Landnahme*) within the Hexateuchal theology of salvation history (*Heilsgeschichte*).⁴⁵ His approach on the Hexateuch was rooted in Gunkel’s form-critical

⁴⁰ While he preferred to use the term style rather than law, he distinguishes the casuistic law and the apodictic instruction. Moshe Weinfeld, “The Origin of the Apodictic Law: An Overlooked Source” *VT* 23.1 (1973) 63-75.

⁴¹ George E. Mendenhall, “Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law,” *BA* 17 (1954), 25-46; Raymond Westbrook, “What is the Covenant Code?” in *Theory and Method in Biblical and Cuneiform Law: Revision, Interpolation, and Development*. JSOTSup 181, ed. Bernard M. Levinson (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1994), 15-36; Johnson M. Kimuhu, *Leviticus: The Priestly Laws and Prohibitions from the Perspective of Ancient Near East and Africa* (New York: Peter Lang, 2008), 222.

⁴² According to Rifat Sonsino, this term is “used in the Aristotelian logic to express certainty and absolute truth.” Rifat Sonsino, “Forms of Biblical Law,” *ABD* 4 (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 253. See also Rifat Sonsino, *Motive Clauses in Hebrew Law* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980). But this kind of criticism on anachronistic use of Greek terms to Hebrew (con)text often happened in case of use of “amphictyony” (M. Noth) and “rhetoric” (J. Muilenburg) within the scholarship of the Hebrew Bible.

⁴³ Sonsino, “Forms of Biblical Law,” 253; Jae Jang followed Sonsino’s classification. Jae Jang, “A Critique on Alt’s Classification of Law” *EOTS* 2 (2006), 165-181.

⁴⁴ Westbrook, “What is the Covenant Code?,” 16.

⁴⁵ Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1962), 15-35; Rolf Rendtorff, “Gerhard von Rad’s Contribution to Biblical Studies” in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Volume 1. Division A. ed. Avigdor Shinan (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), 353-4.

approach in order to trace back the history of how the traditions were transmitted and developed by later editors. He focused on how short, self-contained creedal confessions had evolved into the present form of the Hexateuch.⁴⁶ He presupposed that these creedal elements are core to understanding theological development of Hexateuchal traditions.⁴⁷ As Mowinckel did, he also considered the role of the cultic festival important. His reconsideration, however, was related to the covenant festival⁴⁸ of the cultic tribal confederation (amphictyony) in Gilgal (Passover/*Shavuot*, Josh 4-5, 22:10?⁴⁹) and Shechem (*Sukkot*; Exo 19, Deut 27, Josh. 8:30-35, 24)⁵⁰ during the pre-monarchic period, rather than the autumn divine enthronement festival in the setting of the First Temple. So, he suggested that these short creedal confessions in Deut 26:5b-9, 6:20:24, and Josh 24:2b-13 contain memories of patriarchs, exodus, wilderness, and settlement without the creation and Sinai. von Rad dealt with the Sinai tradition (Ex 19-24, 32-34) separately from the exodus-conquest tradition.

From this point, he tried to reconstruct the history and setting of the formation of a larger text, the Hexateuch. Furthermore, unlike the way Wellhausen and Gunkel considered the roles of later editors—that they were passive mechanical collectors of materials—von Rad viewed their

⁴⁶ Gerhard von Rad, “The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch” in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 1-78. Originally published in 1938.

⁴⁷ Noth had more favor on the Tetrateuch than Hexateuch. He considered that there are five original thematic traditions; (patriarchs, exodus, Sinai, wilderness, and settlement).

⁴⁸ Artur Weiser also discussed this concept. Weiser, *The Psalms*, 35-51.

⁴⁹ Though the name Gilgal was mentioned in LXX, William H. Brownlee preferred to follow MT. Brownlee, “Gilgal” in *ISBE*, Revised ed., vol. 2 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), 471-2.

⁵⁰ While the Gilgal cult was aligned with the Exodus-Conquest tradition, the Shechem cult was connected with the Sinai tradition. See, Herbert B. Huffmon, “Exodus, Sinai and the Credo,” *CBQ* 27.2 (1965), 101-113.

active interpretive role in its *Sitz im Leben*.⁵¹ While he was accepting Wellhausen's theory of JEDP,⁵² he was especially interested in how the Yahwistic (J) traditions were formulated during the time of Solomonic Enlightenment,⁵³ when the old mythic and cultic narratives during the pre-monarchic time⁵⁴ were historicized by scribal engagement and embellishment.⁵⁵ This Solomonic scribal group was responsible for arranging the above-mentioned creedal traditions—initially, with creation, and later, with Sinai—while also forming the Yahwistic version of the Hexateuch within the theological scheme of salvation history. They acted as both author and theologian to arrange these collections into a book with a theological purpose which von Rad called salvation history (*Heilsgeschichte*).⁵⁶ von Rad's *Holy War in Ancient Israel* is an excellent example of how he approached the text.⁵⁷

⁵¹ Thomas Christian Römer, "Elusive Yahwist: A Short History of Research," in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, SBLSymS 34 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 15-16.

⁵² Noth also followed this scheme.

⁵³ Wellhausen dated J in the tenth or ninth century.

⁵⁴ Following Martin Buber, he called this status "primitive pan-sacralism." See, Gerhard von Rad, *Holy War in Ancient Israel*, trans. Marva J. Dawn (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 70.

⁵⁵ The formation of the state creates crisis., von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol.1, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1962), 36-68. Originally published in German, 1957.

⁵⁶ Sweeney evaluated von Rad's *Heilsgeschichte* as too doctrinal without any concerns of Shoah. Sweeney, *TANAK: A Theological and Critical Introduction to the Jewish Bible*. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2012), 8-11.

⁵⁷ Frank Moore Cross criticized von Rad's theory of the Holy War because of the lack of evidence from the ancient near eastern setting of "pre-Yahwstic and non-Israelite peoples." See, Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997; originally published in 1973) 88 (79-90). See also his student, Patrick D. Miller, Jr., "The Divine Council and the Prophetic Call to War," *VT* 18 (1968), 100-107. Ben C. Ollenburger reviews discussions around the holy war. Ollenburger, "Introduction: Gerhard von Rad's Theory of Holy War" in *Holy War in Ancient Israel* (1991), 1-33; More historiographical review is found in, Michael Ufok Udoekpo, *Re-thinking the Day of YHWH and Restoration of Fortunes in the Prophet Zephaniah* (New York: Peter Lang, 2010), 43-79. On current research, read Charles Trimm, "Recent Research on Warfare in the Old Testament" *CBR* 10.2 (2012), 171-216.

von Rad's theory was widely accepted and revised by Protestant scholars in the mid-twentieth century. Frank Moore Cross and Patrick D. Miller revised his theory of the holy war with the observance of ancient Near Eastern texts. Robert B. Coote and David Robert Ord, with socio-historical approaches, reevaluated the role of the Yahwist, seeing them as imperialistic agents during the Solomonic period.⁵⁸ James A. Sanders accepted von Rad's concept of short creedal confessions to show the historical process of canonization.⁵⁹

However, von Rad's Solomonic Yahwist was revisited during the 1970s.⁶⁰ John Van Seters rejected the classical Gunkelian theory of oral tradition as a historical resource. He said,

Form-criticism must also serve as a control over tradition-history and not vice versa. It is not legitimate to prejudge what the form and function of a unit of tradition may have been based on a preconceived history of the tradition, especially oral tradition. It appears to me at the present time that one can say little about any oral tradition. What must be clarified first and foremost is the place of the tradition in Israel's literature and history as reflected in the Old Testament texts. This has been the task of my study.⁶¹

In this respect, Van Seters and Hans Heinrich Schmid argued that J would be a work of an exilic writer in the Babylonian period (sixth century), not a monarchic one in the tenth or

⁵⁸ Robert B. Coote and David Robert Ord, *The Bible's First History: From Eden to the Court of David with the Yahwist* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989). However, the historicity of Solomonic Empire reevaluated and rejected by revisionists and minimalists.

⁵⁹ James A. Sanders, *Torah and Cannon*, second edition. (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books 2005), 20-24.

⁶⁰ Thomas L. Thompson and John Van Seters did consider the Patriarchal narrative as the later works by exilic editors, not the historical sources as Albrightan did. Thomas L. Thompson, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1974); John Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975). Later, Copenhagen School and following biblical minimalists were going further to be suspicious of the historicity of historiography on the First Temple. See firefly argument between P. R. Davies and Ian Provan. Iain W. Provan, "Ideologies, Literary and Critical: Reflections on Recent Writing on the History of Israel," *JBL* 114.4 (1995): 585-606; Philip R. Davies, "Method and Madness: Some Remarks on Doing History with the Bible," *JBL* 114.4 (1995): 699-705.

⁶¹ Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition*, 312.

ninth century.⁶² Rolf Rendtorff was willing to go further to reject the documentary hypothesis and instead to go further on the complexities of tradition.⁶³ Reevaluating Yahwist continues to go on concerning the Priestly tradition during the exilic and post-exilic times.⁶⁴ Marvin A. Sweeney

⁶² Hans Heinrich Schmid, *Der sogenannte Jahwist* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976). The sequence of sources also reconsidered; EDJP (H. H. Schmid, R. K. Gnuse), DJP (Van Seters) and DPJ (Blenkinsopp). The summary of various theories on late dating of the Yahwist and the rejection of the Elohist, see, Robert K. Gnuse, "Redefining the Elohist" *JBL* 119.2 (2000), 201-220. More summary of this issue, David M. Carr, *The Formation of Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 358-360.

⁶³ Rolf Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*, JSOTSup 89, trans. John H. Scullion. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990). Originally published as *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*, BZAW 17 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1977).

⁶⁴ Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, eds., *Farewell to the Yahwist?: The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, SBLSymS 34. (Atlanta: Society Biblical Literature, 2006). Recently, some European and American scholars are focusing on the dis/continuity between Yahwist and Priestly tradition in (post-)exilic period. They prefer to consider Persian and Hellenistic contexts rather than old pan-Babylonian tendencies for dating its contexts. Denis T. Olson mentions, "We could consider a host of newer proposals about the composition and multiple redactional layers of the Pentateuch, saying farewell to the Yahwist or re-defining the Yahwist. Some current proposals prefer to speak of Priestly vs. pre-Priestly, non-Priestly or post-Priestly traditions or redactions. The theme of exile is also intertwined with centuries of the history of reception in Judaism, Christianity, and the larger culture" in his article "From Horeb to Nebo: Exile, the Pentateuch, and the Promise of Home in Exodus 2:1-3:6 and Deuteronomy 34:1-12," in *By the Irrigation Canals of Babylon: Approaches to the Study of the Exile*, ed. John A. Ahn and Jill Middlemas (New York: T&T Clark, 2012), 82. More discussions on post-exilic formation of the Pentateuch, see, Ernest W. Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*. FAT 2.25 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); Konrad Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010); Jaeyoung Jeon, *The Call of Moses and the Exodus Story: A Redactional-critical Study in Exodus 3-4 and 5-13*. FAT 2.60 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013) (esp. Methodology part).

However, the Kaufmann school has different ideas on the Priestly tradition. Since Yehezkel Kaufmann was proposing to posit Priestly tradition within the First Temple context with the origin of monotheism, some Israeli and American scholars were rejecting the Graf-Wellhausen's JEDP and going back to the pre-Wellhausen's sequence of JEPD (e.g., de Wette) in the nineteenth century. See, Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel: From Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*. abridged version. trans. Moshe Greenberg (Jerusalem: Sefer ve-Sefel Publishing, 2003, originally published in Hebrew, 1960), 175-200. Menahem Haran, a student of Kaufmann, was developing the theory of his teacher. See, Haran, *Temples & Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 1-12. "Behind the Scenes of History: Determining the Date of the Priestly Source" *JBL* 100.3 (1981) 321-333 Also, Jacob Milgrom, Avi Hurvitz and Bill T. Arnold were standing in this line of JEP(H)D. See, Ian Young, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensverd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts: Volume 2* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 13-17. Israel Knohl, a student of Moshe Greenberg, distinguished Priestly Torah (PT) which was the earlier priestly material with Holiness School (HS) which was considered as the late recension. This was a reversal of classic understanding that

broadly accepts the general criticism of the classical source, form, and tradition criticism but places the *Sitz im Leben* of Yahwist (J) into the Hezekiah period after the fall of Samaria in 723/2 B.C.E.⁶⁵

1.2.3. Martin Noth: Deuteronomistic History as the Whole Literary Unit

Martin Noth, instead, was interested more extensively in historiography as a self-contained whole because of its ‘simple and unified theological interpretation of history.’⁶⁶ He

the Holiness Code in Lev. 17-26 is earlier than exilic Priestly sources (P). See, Israel Knohl, “The Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School: Sabbath and the Festivals” *HUCA* 58 (1987), 65-117. Recently, Steven L. Cook is following Knol’s theory of PT and HS. Esias E. Meyer criticizes it while he holds the post-exilic dating. Meyer, “Dating the Priestly Text in the Pre-exilic Period: Some Remarks about Anachronistic Slips and Other Obstacles” *Verbum Eccles.* 31.1.1 (2010) (Online). Aly Elrefaei is trying to make a bridge between Wellhausen’s universalism and Kaufmann’s particularism. Elrefaei, *Ancient Israel and Its Religious History in the Works of Julius Wellhausen and Yehezkel Kaufmann*. BZAW 490 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016).

Recently, Joel S. Baden proposed the Neo-Documentary Hypothesis in his book, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, FAT 68 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009). It is trying to revise the classical Graf-Wellhausen’s Documentary Hypothesis (or classical literary criticism) by detaching it from historical and thematic approaches on each source (including E source), instead of focusing on narrative plot development and its characterization. Jeffrey Stackert is summarizing the Badens’ method in his book *A Prophet Like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 19-22. However, Baden’s theory was criticized by Carr (2010) and Schmid (2012). Its response, Baruch J. Schwartz, “Does Recent Scholarship’s Critique of the Documentary Hypothesis Constitute Grounds for Its Rejection?,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz, FAT 78 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 1–16; Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*, AYBRL (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012). See further research: Simeon Chavel, *Oracular Law and Priestly Historiography in the Torah*, FAT 2.71 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014); Jason M. H. Gaines, *The Poetic Priestly Source* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2015); Isabel Cranz, *Atonement and Purification: Priestly and Assyro-Babylonian Perspectives on Sin and Its Consequences*, FAT 2.92 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), Liane M. Feldman, *The Story of Sacrifice: Ritual and Narrative in the Priestly Source*, FAT 141 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020); Sun Bok, Bae, *Ethics and Morality in the Priestly Law and Narrative*. (PhD diss., The University of Chicago, 2021).

⁶⁵ He is holding the EJDP sequence. His model is deeply connected with his redaction model of the Book of Isaiah and DtrH. The Elohist source (E) was earlier than the J layer. Concerning priestly material, he was accepting basic premises of Kaufmann school on the First Temple. Jason Tron’s recent work focuses on how Elohist visionary texts in the Book of Genesis are related to the Northern tradition. Jason Traon, *Visions in the Book of Genesis* (PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2022).

designated it as the Deuteronomistic History (Dtr or DtrH, here I will use DtrH), including the Book of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings because of the thematic continuity with the Book of Deuteronomy. DtrH was written by a single objective author in the middle of the sixth century BCE (exilic period) with no institutional affiliation,⁶⁷ and with no intention of fabrication of history.⁶⁸ DtrH was influenced by traditions from the local shrines like Mizpah and Bethel in Southern Samaria, Benjaminite territory.⁶⁹ Noth's dating of this large unit of historiography is ascribed to the exilic period. He presupposed that this reflected the catastrophic events in 587/6 as a way to explain why the disaster happened and how to overcome it. He discovered the editor's typical theological comments or reflections (Josh 1, 12, 23; Jud. 2:11; 1Sam. 12; 1Kings 8; 2Kings 17). However, his view of this author is more closely aligned with the classic understanding of passive compiler than active interpreter.⁷⁰

Later scholars no longer held Noth's theory of one single objective author. Ernest W. Nicholson and Moshe Weinfeld suggested that the first version of DtrH was composed by a group, which he called Deuteronomistic School, while accepting the later role of the (post-)exilic redactor. Nicholson considered that Dtr historians 'belong to the same circle of tradition as the

⁶⁶ Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 15 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981), 6. This is a partial excerpt from *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (1943). It was translated by Bernard W. Anderson as *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (1972).

⁶⁷ Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 27, 145. The Chronicler's History is later than the DtrH. It is based on the DtrH, according to M. Noth. See his *The Chronicler's History*, JSOTSup 50. trans. H. G. M. Williamson (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987).

⁶⁸ Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 128.

⁶⁹ Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 130.

⁷⁰ Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 120.

authors of Deuteronomy.’⁷¹ The group of people who fled from Northern Israel after the fall of Samaria 722/1 was responsible for making the first version of Dtr and DtrH with the Northern tradition (Sinai/Mosaic) and the Southern theology (Zion/Davidic).⁷² Therefore the first stage of the composition was completed during the reign of Manasseh in the seventh century B.C.E. in Judah while Moshe Weinfeld proposed it was completed during the Hezekian period.⁷³

This theory was further developed into two or more redactional theories in various stages of its composition. First of all, the double redaction theory is introduced by Cross (1973)⁷⁴ and his followers, including Jon Levenson (1975),⁷⁵ Richard D. Nelson (1981)⁷⁶, Richard E. Friedman (1981)⁷⁷, and Baruch Halpern (1988)⁷⁸ (a.k.a. Harvard School). According to Cross, a student of William F. Albright, the first version of Deuteronomistic History (Dtr1) was composed during the Josianic era to debunk the legacy of Northern Israel and to complement the Davidic

⁷¹ Ernest W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition: Literary and Historical Problems in the Book of Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 113-114.

⁷² Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition*, 108-9. Recently, refugee theory is supported by Israel Finkelstein. However, it is challenged by Nadav Na'aman and Philippe Guillaume because of the diverse social-cultural causes of emigration. Koog P. Hong well summarized this in his “The Deceptive Pen of Scribes: Judean Reworking of the Bethel Tradition as a Program for Assuming Israelite Identity” *Bib* 92.3 (2011) 427-441.

⁷³ Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1972); Helga Weippert, “Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher” *Bib* 53.3 (1972), 301-339.

⁷⁴ Frank Moore Cross “The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History” in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1973), 274-290.

⁷⁵ Jon D. Levenson, “Who inserted the Book of the Torah?” *HTR* 68.3-4 (1975) 203-33.

⁷⁶ Richard Nelson-Jones (a.k.a. Richard Donald Nelson), *Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 18 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981).

⁷⁷ Richard E. Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works*, HSM 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1981). He was arguing that Dtr2 would be the work of Jeremiah and Baruch in 538 B.C.E.

⁷⁸ Baruch Halpern, *The First Historians The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* (San Francisco: Harper & Row 1988).

dynasty which was considered the ideal form of monarchy. Dtr1 attributed the cause of the demise of Northern Israel to the sin of Jeroboam ben Nebat. Similarly, Manasseh ben Hezekiah was described as a contributor to the fall of Jerusalem. Cross thought this theological evaluation was added by later scribes (Dtr2) during the early exilic time. Nelson, a student of John Bright, also developed Cross's theory by observing differences in terms of the regnal formulae, linguistic features, dynastic oracles (conditional and unconditional), and theological themes (the ark, the land, heroes and villains, and the Northern Kingdoms) between pre-exilic and exilic authors.⁷⁹ Generally it is acknowledged that the multiple redactions of DtrH are suggested by the so-called Göttingen or Smend school. Half right, half wrong. Rudolph Smend Jr., from his stylistic observation on texts from Joshua and Judges, proposes that two redactional parts constitute the Deuteronomistic History; DtrG (*Grundschrift*; Noth's Dtr/DtrH) and DtrN (nomistic). He posits that the nomistic redaction happened a little later than DtrG during the exilic time. His presupposition of the later redaction is related to the Wellhausenian pan-Babylonianism that the legal materials are later than other records.⁸⁰ Smend's DtrN hypothesis is developed by his student, Walter Dietrich, who focused on the prophetic narrative in Kings. He suggested one more redactional layer, the so-called DtrP (prophetic) layer, between DtrG and

⁷⁹ Richard Donald Nelson considered that Dtr1 was political propaganda to serve the Davidic dynasty during Josiah's time. In his earlier work, concerning the death of Josiah in Megiddo, he argued that Josiah was a nominal vassal of the Assyrian Empire and he was welcome to meet Necho II to meet or support. See his "Realpolitik in Judah (687-609 B.C.E.)," in *Scripture in Context II: More Essays on the Comparative Method*, ed. W. W. Hallo, J. C. Moyer, and L. G. Perdue (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 177-89. It is still controversial what happened in 609 B.C.E and Josiah's attitude to Assyria and Egypt.

⁸⁰ Rudolf Smend, "The Law and the Nations, A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History" trans. Peter T. Daniels, in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*, eds. Gary N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 95-110. = "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Festschrift Gerhard von Rad*, ed. H. W. Wolff (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1971), 494-509.

DtrN. Dietrich dated this prophetic stage within the early exilic period 580-560.⁸¹ Timo Veijola's study of the contradictory evaluation on the monarch (DtrG: positive, DtrN: negative) agrees with Smend-Dietrich's suggestion.⁸² As Gary N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville point out, the Smend school differs from the Cross school “methodologically, Smend’s analysis beginning at the sentence level, whereas Cross’s was based on large-scale trends in the whole work.”⁸³ However, this theory fails to deal adequately with earlier prophetic and nomistic traditions before the exile.⁸⁴

The following scholars were reevaluating the pros and cons of both double and multiple redactions, and then proposing their views. First, Ian Provan (1988),⁸⁵ Gary Knoppers (1993-4),⁸⁶ Sweeney (2001),⁸⁷ and Song-Mi Suzie Park (2015)⁸⁸ are more focused on theological development in Dtr1. Provan and Sweeney, as M. Weinfeld and H. Weippert did, proposed the

⁸¹ Walter Dietrich, *Prophetie Und Geschichte: Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung Zum Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*, FRLANT 108 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972); See also his “Martin Noth and the Future of the Deuteronomistic History,” trans. Dwight R. Daniels, in *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*, ed. S. L. McKenzie and M. P. Graham (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 153-75.

⁸² Timo Veijola, *Die Ewige Dynastie: David Und Die Entstehung Seiner Dynastie Nach Der Deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1975); Timo Veijola, *Das Konigtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1977).

⁸³ The editorial preface comes from Smend, “The Law and the Nations,” 95.

⁸⁴ Brian Neil Peterson, *The Authors of the Deuteronomistic History: Locating a Tradition in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014), 12. He introduces Thomas Römer, Gary Knoppers, and Chaim Rabin’s criticisms.

⁸⁵ Iain W. Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate About the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*, BZAW 172 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1988).

⁸⁶ Gary N. Knoppers, *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*. Two volumes, HSM 52-53 (Leiden: Brill, 1993-4).

⁸⁷ Marvin A. Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

⁸⁸ Song-Mi Suzie Park, *Hezekiah and the Dialogue of Memory* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2015).

Hezekian layer of DtrH. Second, M. A. O'Brien (a student of A. F. Campbell) (1989),⁸⁹ while he was accepting the Josianic and the exilic versions, proposes the third layer of DtrH during the post-exilic time. Recent works focus more on the final form of DtrH, which is posited in the context of the Persian period, with its intertextual concerns.⁹⁰ Third, Stephen L. McKenzie (1991)⁹¹, following Van Seters, questioned the basic premise of redaction theory. T. Römer designated this tendency as Neo-Nothians.⁹² Fourth, with the rise of new literary methods, R. Polzin (1980)⁹³, Gale Yee (1985)⁹⁴, Gina Hens-Piazza (2006), and Barbara Green (2000, 2017) avoided discussing the historical and redactional issues around DtrH. However, Hye Kyung Park (2015) tried Elijah-Elisha diachronically and synchronically with the feminist lens. Lastly, Uriah Kim's (2006) postcolonial reading of DtrH should be mentioned. His criticism of Noth's project on DtrH is related to the criticism of the Western/Caucasian notion of nationalism, so he called the 'history our own.' So, like Edward Said and Keith Whitelam, he questions the necessity to read the Josianic version of DtrH as the history of marginalized people as a 'history that is their own' to defend their liminal identity in the imperial context. However, scholars argue that

⁸⁹ M. A. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).

⁹⁰ Mignon Jacobs and Raymond F. Person Jr., eds., *Israelite Prophecy and the Deuteronomistic History: Portrait, Reality, and the Formation of a History* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013).

⁹¹ Steven L. McKenzie, *Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*, VTSup 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1991).

⁹² Thomas Christian Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction*. (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 31-33.

⁹³ Robert Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (New York: Seabury, 1980).

⁹⁴ Gale Yee, ed., *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*, second edition (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007).

nationalistic historiography in Dtr1 does not foster the colonial desire to form a nation-state.⁹⁵ Marvin A. Sweeney (2001, 2007)⁹⁶ and Eun Suk Cho (2002)⁹⁷, K.P. Hong (2011)⁹⁸ have all argued that the concept of reunifying the nation-state should be related to the emergence of the pan-Israelite identity in Judah.

Douglas A. Knight focused on how tradents preserved and transmitted the oral tradition to the next two components of tradition that were discussed, based on the cause-and-effect scheme; *traditio* as the process of tradition and *traditum* as referring to contents or materials that were based on *traditio*.⁹⁹ Since Michael Fishbane redefined the relationship of *traditio* and *traditum* in the context of written tradition, the primary concern of tradition history is moving its focus to issues around literacy and scribalism and away from orality.¹⁰⁰ In other words, Fishbane redefined Knight's concept in order to describe how ancient scribes were not only copyists but also interpreters: "The 'annotative' *traditio* of biblical scribes is thus a product of the 'copyist' *traditio* of the ancient *traditum*: it is here that ancient Israelite scribal comments and corrections find their life-context and occasion."¹⁰¹ It implies that the scribes were active readers who communicated with texts and produced new meanings. This significant turn from oral to written

⁹⁵ Uriah Kim's usage of nationalism is paralleled with colonialism, imperialism, orientalism, and neocolonialism. Kim, *Decolonizing Josiah: Toward a Postcolonial Reading of the Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005). However, the nation-state movement in modern Europe was the effort of independence from the empire. The twenty-eighth U.S. president Woodrow Wilson's self-determinism was proposed in this vein.

⁹⁶ Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah* (2001); Also, his review on Uriah Kim in *CBQ* 69.1 (2007) 120-122.

⁹⁷ Eun Suk Cho, *Josianic Reform in the Deuteronomistic History Reconstructed in the Light of Factionalism and Use of Royal Apology* (PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2002).

⁹⁸ Hong, "The Deceptive Pen of Scribes" *Biblica* 92 (2011) 427-441.

⁹⁹ Douglas A. Knight, *The Traditions of Israel*, SBLDiss 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 5-20.

¹⁰⁰ Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 6-19.

¹⁰¹ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 37.

tradition is profoundly based on the growing interest of final form in relation to redaction, structure, new-literary, and canonical criticism.

1.3. Third Generation: The Literary Structure of the Final Form

1.3.1. Structuralism

Since the 1960s, the major interest of biblical scholarship moved away from oral history and its transmission behind the text. Similar to scholarship before Gunkel, it revived significant concern for the written text (esp. the final form) and the role of the scribe. From the diachronic point of view, critics of the classical form and tradition were challenged by the minimalists and revisionists. From the synchronic point of view, the new literary critics aimed to read the text itself and even go beyond. Further, the social-scientific and ideological readings were affected by the civil rights and anti-war movements of the 1960s. Even though these revolutionary challenges seemed to pose a major threat, or divergence, within classical biblical scholarship,¹⁰² this did not mean the complete demise of form criticism. Instead, it made form-critics allow methodological extension by interacting and hybridizing with new approaches to the text.

Wolfgang Richter, influenced by Ferdinand de Saussure's semiotics, contended that the exegete carefully dissect the form and content when he observes linguistic structures in the text. Saussure opened the gate for the linguistic turn from a diachronic to a synchronic approach. In his *Course in General Linguistics* (1916), he separated the language system into two theoretical

¹⁰² Koog P. Hong, *Towards the Hermeneutics of Responsibility: A Linguistic, Literary, and Historical Reading of Genesis 28:10–22* (PhD diss., Claremont Graduate University, 2011), 37, 43.

aspects; *langue* (language) and *parole* (speech).¹⁰³ *Langue* is the abstract systematic principle of linguistic signs shared by those living in the speech community. This is the internal structure of the linguistic system. In contrast, *parole* is more external. It means individual communication, articulation, utterance, or performance of a language system in reality.¹⁰⁴ By doing this, Saussure highlighted the importance of the internal structure of language as well as the external one. He argues that “the study of external linguistic phenomena is most fruitful; but to say that we cannot understand the internal linguistic organism without studying external phenomena is wrong.”¹⁰⁵

Richter’s form-critical analysis of the biblical text stands in this category. He attempted to make a clear distinction between 1) form and genre, 2) inner form and outer form, and 3) *Sitz im Leben* and *Sitz im Literatur*.¹⁰⁶ First, he took precautions against mixing typical genre (*Gattung*: abstract pattern of text formation) and particular form (*Formen*: actual particular text).¹⁰⁷ As Blum mentions, “he differentiates between ‘form criticism,’ based on the description of the particular text in its individual form, and ‘genre criticism,’ which attempts to establish the formative ‘structural pattern’ in an analytical comparison of independent particular texts.”¹⁰⁸

¹⁰³ Ferdinand de Saussure, *The Course in General Linguistics*. trans. Wade Baskin (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959, originally published in 1916), 17-20. See also, Roland Barthes, *Elements of Semiology*. trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967; Originally published in 1964), 13-17.

¹⁰⁴ In this vein, Saussure also differentiated the system of sign in two parts; *signifié* (signifier = form/concept/sign) and *signifiant* (signified = content/meaning). Meanwhile the first is related to mental facts (linguistic concepts), the latter is to linguistic sound (sound-image). de Saussure, *General Linguistics*, 65-7.

¹⁰⁵ Saussure, *General Linguistics*, 22.

¹⁰⁶ Wolfgang Richter, *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft: Entwurf einer alttestamentlichen Literaturtheorie und Methodologie*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).

¹⁰⁷ Erhard Blum, “Formgeschichte - A Misleading Category? Some Critical Remarks” in *The Changing Face* (2003), 33 (footnote 4).

¹⁰⁸ Blum, “Formgeschichte,” 33.

Richter's distinction influences Sweeney's definition of form and genre.¹⁰⁹ However, Buss considers it as a particularist view considering “genre only as abstraction from individuals.”¹¹⁰

Second, influenced by Saussure, Richter separated form into two parts; outer form and inner form.¹¹¹ While the inner form (*Innere Form*) is identified with the deep structure of the concepts that it communicates (*langue*), the outer form (*Äußere Form*) is with its linguistic expression (*parole*). The latter is equivalent to Richter's definition of ‘form.’ As Blum precisely analyzed, however, Richter's inner form did not show how ‘form’ is opposite to ‘content’ by close inspection of Richter's examples. According to Blum,

Either the definitional limitation of “form” based on the aspects of expression is maintained; then a form analysis will, however, be restricted to aspects of the so-called

¹⁰⁹ “Form refers to the unique formulation of an individual text or communication, whereas genre refers to the typical conventions of expression or language that appear within the text.” Marvin A. Sweeney, “Form Criticism,” in *To Each Its Own Meaning, Revised and Expanded: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*, ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 59. See also his “Form Criticism,” in *Method Matters: Essays on the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David L. Petersen*, ed. Joel M. LeMon and Kent Harold Richards (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 17-38; and “Form Criticism,” in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry, and Writings*, ed. Tremper Longman III and Peter Enns (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2010), Credo Reference.

¹¹⁰ He introduces five philosophical perspectives to deal with form criticism: 1) Platonic nominalism (aristocratic and elitist); 2) Aristotelian essentialism (democratic); 3) particularism (libertarian or authoritarian); 4) relationalism; and; 5) skepticism (nihilism). He describes Gunkel had characteristics of Aristotelian essentialism (stressing fixity of genres, not fluidity) and particularism (associating genres with settings, not purposes). Martin J. Buss, *The Changing Shape of Form Criticism: A Relational Approach* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010), 47 (footnote 47). Buss himself was identified as a relationalist. See his “Form Criticism,” in *To Each Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Applications*, first edition, ed. Stephen R. Haynes and Steven L. McKenzie (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 69-86; *Biblical Form Criticism and its Context*, JSOTSup 274 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 255-62.

¹¹¹ This categorization belongs to the structural form (the analysis and description of syntax and stylistics), not ornament form (phonemes, consonants, vowels, and syllables). T. D. Mayfield, *Literary Structure and Setting in Ezekiel*. FAT 2.43. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 70; David R. Law, *The Historical-Critical Method: A Guide for the Perplexed* (New York: T&T Clark, 2012), 160. Blum was confusing this in his footnote 22, in “Formgeschichte,” 39.

outer form. Or “form” also includes the content structure of a text; then, however, the opposition “form :: content” is discarded.¹¹²

Lastly, Richter distinguished between the *Sitz im Leben* (social setting) and *Sitz in der Literatur* (literary setting).¹¹³ As Buss points out, this concept is not “a secondary development after Gunkel but marked the starting-point of his thinking about a *Sitz*”¹¹⁴ since Gunkel's original idea was more related to the home of a genre than the context of a particular text. The identifying *Sitz im Leben* as a social setting was introduced and developed by later scholars like Koch.¹¹⁵ There is no question that the concept of *Sitz im Leben* was separate from *Sitz in der Literatur* in the mid-twentieth century. Alonso-Schökel¹¹⁶ and Richter¹¹⁷ highlighted the balance between the diachronic and synchronic reading of the biblical text, unlike another tendency to detach

¹¹² Blum, “Formgeschichte,” 40.

¹¹³ Non-German speaking scholars often call it *Sitz im Literatur*. Nora K. Schmid points out this error in her review on Carlos A. Segovia. in *Der Islam* 97.2 (2020), 622.

¹¹⁴ Buss, *The Changing Shape*, 191 (footnote 118); *Biblical Form Criticism and its Context*, 235.

¹¹⁵ Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism and its Context*, 234.

¹¹⁶ L. Alonso-Schökel also proposed the same concept in the same age; “Ich möchte es unterstreichen: der Prophet mag zwei, drei kleinere oder grössere Orakel zu verschiedenen Zeiten ausgesprochen haben: wir tun recht, wenn wir jedes Orakel isolieren und seinen ursprünglichen Ort suchen. Das genügt aber nicht. Die Orakel haben auch einen literarischen Ort. Es ist durchaus möglich, dass der Prophet oder ein Schüler aus den einzelnen Orakeln eine neue, sinnträchtige Komposition verfasst, ja geschaffen hat; und dann müssen wir auch dem neuen Sinn ehrfürchtig nachgehen. Neben dem Sitz im Leben steht der Sitz in der Literatur.” L. Alonso-Schökel, “Die stilistische Analyse bei den Propheten” in *Congress Volume Oxford 1959*. VTSup 7. ed. G.W. Anderson et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1960), 162.

¹¹⁷ Richter said, “Diese nachahmenden Gattungen sind besonders aufschlußreich für das Ziel einer Komposition. Damit ergibt sich aber, daß nicht nur Formen und geprägte Wendungen, sondern auch Gattungen und Formeln für die Frage nach dem “Sitz in der Literatur” wichtig werden. Die Untersuchung der Gattung gewinnt so an Bedeutung für Beurteilung und Deutung literarischer Werke.” in *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft*, 148.

literature from history.¹¹⁸ They admitted that the possibility of multiple *Sitz im Leben* or redactional stratum can exist within the text.¹¹⁹

Rolf P. Knierim, a student of Gerhard von Rad, tried to supplement the existing form criticism as James Muilenburg did. Yet his method was different from the one that Muilenburg and his successors emphasized—the stylistic uniqueness of individual texts.¹²⁰ He tried to synthesize the diachronic and synchronic approaches based on his modified proposal of form criticism.¹²¹ He criticized the designation of genre and its institutional/cultic setting which claims that classical form criticism (folklore studies, myth, and ritual studies) is rooted in a preconception in the researcher’s mind. He said,

If, however, linguistic genres and institutional settings taken together can depend on preconceptualizations, we must revise one of the traditional form-critical assumptions. A genre is no longer to be constituted by its societal setting. A potential autonomy vis-à-vis setting can be attributed to generic language.¹²²

¹¹⁸ J. Cheryl Exum said, “Only the Sitz in der Literatur concerns me here.” See, Exum, “Of Broken Pots, Fluttering Birds and Visions in the Night: Extended Simile and Poetic Technique in Isaiah” *CBQ* 43.3. (1981), 339.

¹¹⁹ Koowon Kim, in his footnote 79, is confusing the concept of *Sitz im Leben* and *Sitz in der Literatur*. See, Kim, *Type-scene in the Aqhatu, Kirta, and Hannah Stories: A Form-critical and Narratological Study of KTU 1.14 I-1.15 III, 1.17 I-II, and 1 Samuel 1:1-2:11*, VTSup 145 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 21.

¹²⁰ On Muilenburg, Knierim evaluated that “Muilenburg, too, was dissatisfied with form criticism’s one-sided concentration on the originally short units and their generic typicality. In addition to that work, he called attention to the creative role of individual authors in smaller units as well as larger compositions. He proposed to analyze their style by identifying the rhetorical devices used in them. In turn, such analysis would allow him to recognize the individual oral style behind the written style and to establish the independence of written and oral literature” Rolf Knierim, “Criticism of Literary Features, Form, Tradition, and Redaction” (originally published in 1985) in *Reading the Hebrew Bible for a New Millennium: Form, Concept, and Theological Perspective, Volume 2: Exegetical and Theological Studies*. ed. Wonil Kim et al. (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000), 13.

¹²¹ Rolf Knierim, “Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered” (originally published in 1973) in *Reading the Hebrew Bible for a New Millennium: Form, Concept, and Theological Perspective, Volume 2: Exegetical and Theological Studies* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000), 61-62.

¹²² Knierim, “Reconsidered,” 45.

As Wimsatt and Beardsley pointed out, Knierim also recognized how previous form critics fell into the intentional fallacy.¹²³ He gave more attention to synchronic linguistics and structural anthropology, which Saussure and Claude Lévi-Strauss represented, to dig in “a certain state of prelinguistic conceptualization (*état de langue*).” In other words, the linguistic forms and patterns are associated with ‘the collective consciousness on its prelinguistic level.’¹²⁴ He notes,

This assumption opens perspectives for the explanation of the possible origins and identity traits of generic language, which go, in principle, beyond the framework of interpretation provided by traditional form criticism. If the typical forms that pervade individual and diverse expression actually come from underlying matrices that the human mind generates, then the structuralists’ particular notion of “structure” may be able to offer additional criteria for the identification of genres.¹²⁵

Knierim’s project, to find origins, is going further and deeper in pursuit of linguistic structure. Genres, generically patterned language, are now regarded as independent linguistic phenomena from a particular space and time.¹²⁶ By no means did he dismiss the etiological effort to find genre in the diachronic dimension. He recognized new perspectives on patterned, formulaic language and its setting and theme based on the folkloristic understanding.¹²⁷

Here Knierim invited Richter into his discussion. Following Richter’s redefinition of form to the individual text and genre to a text-type, Knierim’s definition of genre is proposed as “a structural model or scheme (*Strukturmuster*).”¹²⁸ In other words, the typicality belongs to the

¹²³ William Kurtz Wimsatt and Monroe C. Beardsley “Intentional Fallacy” *The Sewanee Review* 54.3 (1946), 468-488.

¹²⁴ Knierim, “Reconsidered,” 46.

¹²⁵ Knierim, “Reconsidered,” 46.

¹²⁶ Knierim, “Reconsidered,” 47.

¹²⁷ Knierim, “Reconsidered,” 49.

¹²⁸ Knierim, “Reconsidered,” 51.

definition of genre. The uniqueness is to the individual texts. This idea is not different from structuralists, rhetorical critics, and narratologists dealing with biblical texts. At this point, this structural and synchronic understanding that form and genre make a problem with the setting (*Sitz im Leben*) is challenged.

Nevertheless, the conclusion seems unavoidable that “setting,” in the sense biblical form criticism has understood it, cannot be regarded indispensably as one of the factors that constitute genre, not if genre is understood as a linguistic phenomenon.¹²⁹

This problem makes some new literary critics throw history (the baby) out with the bath water. Relying on Richter’s view, Knierim did not stand with this radical approach to the text. He believed that the genre and the setting are correlated with each other in the linguistic and literary framework. He defines the setting as something that “is assumed to provide or produce the matrix to which typical linguistic units owe their existence.”¹³⁰ This matrix “produces the structural models.”¹³¹ As Margaret S. Odell observes, his use of matrix has a nuance to allow for a more flexible and accurate way of correlating genre and setting.¹³² The concept of setting is connected with the socio-anthropological and literary structure, not just the particular institutional and cultic setting. That is why Knierim's setting would change from *Sitz im Leben* to *Sitz in der Literatur*.¹³³

This progressive idea continued when he was dealing with tradition and redaction. First, he believed that tradition history is rooted in form criticism, and it should be dealing with both

¹²⁹ Knierim, “Reconsidered,” 47.

¹³⁰ Knierim, “Reconsidered,” 52.

¹³¹ Knierim, “Reconsidered,” 53.

¹³² Margaret S. Odell, “Ezekiel Saw What He Said He Saw: Genres, Forms, and the Vision of Ezekiel 1” in *The Changing Face* (2003), 168.

¹³³ Knierim, “Reconsidered,” 61, 68-9.

oral and written transmission.¹³⁴ Second, he considered the role of the redactor not only as a passive mechanical collector or compiler, but also as an active author, editor, interpreter, or theologian who has a theological concern in particular settings.¹³⁵ This idea leads to paying attention to how the redactor re-reads the earlier traditions and re-formulates them within their theological framework. For researching the redactor's theological concern, it is necessary to presuppose and reconstruct the redactor's various settings: historical, social, and literary.

To conclude, Knierim harmonizes and synthesizes both diachronic and synchronic readings, unlike previous scholars. He was one of the editors of the *Forms of the Old Testament Literature* series (FOTL, published from 1981 to 2016) with Tucker and Sweeney. The format of this series is divided into four subunits: 1) structure; 2) genre; 3) setting; and 4) intention. This reflects how Knierim and his contemporaries expanded and developed his way of form and redaction criticism in his scholarship. Further, his concern about the larger form and structure is deeply connected with other intertextual approaches like inner-biblical reading (Fishbane), final-form reading (Rendtorff), canonical reading (Childs), and comparative midrash (Sanders).¹³⁶ Sweeney is one of Knierim's students who follows his synthetic method of diachronic and synchronic approaches in terms of form, genre, setting, and structure. By the 1990's, Sweeney had written a number of encyclopedic entries to introduce form critical methods.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ Knierim, "Criticism," 24-28.

¹³⁵ Knierim, "Criticism," 28-31.

¹³⁶ James W. Flanagan also should be mentioned though it aims to suggest a syncretical method to study the history of ancient Israel. James W. Flanagan, "History as Hologram: Integrating Literary, Archaeological, and Comparative Sociological Evidence" in SBLSP 1985. ed. Kent Harold Richards (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 291-314.

¹³⁷ Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39: With an Introduction to Prophetic Literature*. FOTL 16 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 12; "Form Criticism" in *To Each Own Meaning: Revised* (1999). 67. Serge Frolov describes the Knierim-Sweeney's guideline as more tilting to synchronic contribution. Serge Frolov, "Is Form Criticism Compatible with

1.3.2. Rhetorical Criticism

The movement going beyond form criticism flourished in scholarship. James Muilenburg's well-known *SBL* presidential address in 1968 presented the academic challenge to search for post-Gunkelian form criticism. He proposed to go further to observe unique, stylistic, and unrepeatable features of the text itself. This was a direct challenge to classical form-critical scholarship. Muilenburg's primary interest was in unique stylistic forms, identified as *parole* by Saussure, and 'outer form' by Richter. This contrasted with the trend by Gunkel and his followers to focus on abstract and typical patterns of genre. In his 1953 work, which reconsidered the work of Richard Lowth and Herman Gunkel, he pointed out that genres are not repeated as synonymous with form in reality; "The parallel line does not simply repeat what has been said, but enriches it, deepens it, transforms it by adding fresh nuances and bringing in new elements, renders it more concrete and vivid and telling."¹³⁸ With the concern of the criticism of anachronistic use of classical Greek devices in ancient Semitic literature, Muilenburg defined the term Hebrew rhetoric as "the style and composition of various literary types and forms"¹³⁹ to show the writer's theological thought. His method did not differ substantially from the line of form criticism.¹⁴⁰ Calling his method rhetorical criticism, he identified two tasks: 1) to determine

Diachronic Exegesis? Rethinking Genesis 1-2 after Knierim and Sweeney," in *Partners with God: Theological and Critical Readings of the Bible in Honor of Marvin A. Sweeney*, ed. Shelley L. Birdsong and Serge Frolov (Claremont, CA: Claremont Press, 2017), 13-26.

¹³⁸ James Muilenburg, "A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style," in *Congress Volume Copenhagen 1953*, ed. G.W. Anderson et al. VTSup 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1953), 98.

¹³⁹ James Muilenburg, "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle ׀ in the Old Testament," *HUCA* 32 (1961): 137.

¹⁴⁰ "Such criticisms as I now propose to make do not imply a rejection so much as an appeal to venture beyond the confines of form criticism into an inquiry into other literary features which are all too frequently ignored today." James Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond" *JBL* 88.1 (1969), 4, 18.

the scope of pericope and observe it with rhetorical devices; and 2) to recognize the structure of the composition and observe how this is interwoven with pericope and writer's thought.¹⁴¹ In response to those who considered his method as an unscientific and subjective method from the researcher's mind (not exegesis, but eisegesis), he admitted that "in matters of this sort there is no substitute for literary sensitivity."¹⁴² While Muilenburg proposed his rhetorical criticism as supplementary to the form criticism, Phyllis Tribble viewed her teacher's proposal as a method: "even though he assigned his methodology a modest status as a supplement to form criticism, it has become a full-fledged biblical discipline practiced in different ways."¹⁴³ Jack R. Lundbom, however, with an agreement with C. Clifton Black hesitated to view it as a *bona fide* method but rather as an interpretive perspective because "perhaps Muilenburg's rhetorical criticism assumes for "method" a definition too loose to be meaningful. If so, some controls must be put into place."¹⁴⁴ In this vein he viewed rhetorical criticism as a "mixture of science and art."¹⁴⁵

Unlike Muilenburg's proposal to view the text as literary art, Yehoshua Gitay, a student of Hayes, defined 'rhetoric' differently. Influenced by George Alexander Kennedy's research on classical rhetoric and Stanley Fish's reader-oriented approach, he was more focused on the persuasive aspect of rhetoric. Kennedy, the classist and New Testament scholar, said, "Aristotle's objective in writing his Rhetoric was not to describe Greek rhetoric, but to describe this universal

¹⁴¹ Muilenburg, "Beyond," 8-10.

¹⁴² Muilenburg, "Beyond," 9.

¹⁴³ Phyllis Tribble, *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah*, OTS (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1994), 32.

¹⁴⁴ Jack R. Lundbom, *Writing Up Jeremiah: The Prophet and the Book* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2013), 93. C. Clifton Black "Keeping up with Recent Studies: XVI. Rhetorical Criticism and Biblical Interpretation" *The Expository Times* 100.7 (1989), 252-258.

¹⁴⁵ Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), xxxii.

facet of human communication.”¹⁴⁶ However, as Muilenburg already recognized, it is hard to define the traits of Hebrew rhetoric as universal or particular.¹⁴⁷ That is why Muilenburg and his followers were more interested in the rhetoric of composition. But Gitay preferred Kennedy’s definition. In this vein, he criticized Muilenburg and his followers because they are too focused on the “style as a functional device for determining the literary unit and its structure, but this function is not oriented towards the pragmatic goal of persuasion employed by rhetoric.”¹⁴⁸ Rhetoric was understood as orator’s speech intended to persuade public audiences in the ancient Greco-Roman culture (Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian). So, Gitay (1978) was utilizing the first three of Quintilian’s five canons of rhetoric¹⁴⁹ in the communicative view of an orator (rhetor, speaker, writer), discourse (speech, text), and audience (listener, hearer, reader).¹⁵⁰ Tribble recognized methodological differences between Muilenburg and Gitay. She commented on Gitay’s proposal: “the explicit appropriation of these sources (from classical and modern

¹⁴⁶ George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 10.

¹⁴⁷ Muilenburg, “Beyond,” 12.

¹⁴⁸ Yehoshua Gitay, *Rhetorical Analysis of Isaiah 40-48: A Study of the Art of Prophetic Persuasion* (PhD diss., Emory University, 1978), 56.

¹⁴⁹ *inventio*/invention, *dispositio*/arrangement, *electio*/style

¹⁵⁰ Gitay did not much deal with Quintilian’s last two; memory and delivery. See, his *Rhetorical Analysis*, 84. Brad E. Kelle was accepting the basic premise of Gitay but going further with metaphor theory. Brad E. Kelle, *Hosha 2: Metaphor and Rhetoric in Historical Perspective* (PhD diss., Emory University, 2003), 29-48. Beon Jin Jeon was, though he was accepting Gitay’s premise of rhetoric as the art of persuasion, he clung more closely to Aristotle’s three modes of proof (*ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*) in relation to the speaker’s mentality rather than Quintilian’s five canons. See, Beon Jin Jeon, *Rhetoric of the Book of Amos: Amos for the Seventh-Century Judean Audience*. (PhD diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2015), 51-65. Recent work, Daegon Ko, *The Message of Hope from the True Messenger: A Rhetorical Study of Jeremiah 26-45*. (PhD diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2021).

rhetoricians), and the omission of form-critical insights separated his analysis from that of Muilenburg (the parenthetical comment is mine).”¹⁵¹

In this respect, Tribble indicated that the school of rhetoric as the art of persuasion would not exclude the art of composition out as they were doing the close readings.¹⁵² She revisited the four different orientations (mimetic, pragmatic, expressive, and objective) on the texts proposed by M. H. Abrams.¹⁵³ Borrowing Northrop Frye’s two divisions of rhetorical criticism ornamental speech (*opsis*) and persuasive speech (*melos*), Tribble tried to review and expand the theoretical background of the rhetorical criticism to build it as the method.¹⁵⁴ She harmonized Muilenburg’s emphasis on the art of composition and Gitay’s emphasis on the art of persuasion into her rhetorical criticism as a method. In this vein, she went further to apply feminist-literary approaches with rhetoric and metaphor theory within the biblical text.¹⁵⁵

Gina Hens-Piazza, a student of Tribble, was proposing the socio-rhetorical approach which “targets the intrinsic “story world” of biblical narrative.”¹⁵⁶ Instead of classifying a particular genre and searching for *Sitz im Leben*, she was more interested in plot, characters, setting (time and space) within the narrative. Her socio-anthropological view was later developed

¹⁵¹ Tribble, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 42-43.

¹⁵² Tribble, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 48, 52, 73,

¹⁵³ Tribble, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 10-13; M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953), 3-29.

¹⁵⁴ Tribble, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 62-63, 73, 79-80. Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), 243-340.

¹⁵⁵ Phyllis Tribble, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*, OBT (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978); *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*, OBT (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

¹⁵⁶ Gina Hens-Piazza, *Of Methods, Monarchs, and Meanings: Sociorhetorical Approach to Exegesis* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996), 32.

into new-historicism (S. Greenblatt).¹⁵⁷ Unlike historical criticism, this method considered literary text (including historiography) as cultural products through the archaeology of knowledge theories of Michel Foucault.¹⁵⁸ Tribble and her followers focused on interpreting literary texts (including historiography) by using text-oriented and reader-oriented methods while they dismissed diachronic aspects of exegesis.

1.3.3. Narratology

As we have observed above, the literary turn began in the 1960s. Along with structural and rhetorical revisions to old form-critical methods with synchronic attention on the language and text, biblical scholarship was conjoined with new literary critical theories which dealt with how a story was delivered from the text to the reader. This shift was regarded as revolutionary whether it had positive or negative effects. Literary analysis of biblical text has flourished in various ways since the 1960s.¹⁵⁹ Here we are limited to our discussion of two Jewish literary scholars, Robert Alter and Meir Sternberg. The debate on the Bible as literature or not had been emerging since Menachem Perry and Meir Sternberg published the article “The King Through Ironic Eyes: The Narrator’s Devices in the Story of David and Bathsheba and Two Excurses on

¹⁵⁷ Stephan Greenblatt, “The Forms of Power and the Power of Forms in the Renaissance” *Genre* 15 (1982), 1-4; Gina Hens-Piazza, *The New Historicism*, OTS (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002); Jürgen Pieters “New Historicism: Postmodern Historiography Between Narrativism and Heterology” *History and Theory: Studies in the Philosophy of History* 39.1 (2002), 21-38.

¹⁵⁸ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Routledge, 2002, originally published in 1969).

¹⁵⁹ Various series of new interpretations flourished after the 1960s. 1) *Ha-sifrut* at the University of Tel Aviv (1968-1983); 2) Semeia studies of SBL (1974-2002); 3) *JSOT* (since 1976) and *JSOTSup* (now *LHBOTS* of T&T Clark); which emerged from the Sheffield school; 4) *OBT* series of Fortress Press (since 1978); and 5) *LCBI* series of Westminster John Knox Press in 1990s.

the Theory of the Narrative Text,” in *Hasifrut* 1 (1968).¹⁶⁰ While historians, whether or not they belong to maximalists and minimalists, had long debated what happened in the history of ancient Israel by reviewing archaeological and biblical materials, literary scholars were more interested in the narrator and his technique than in the author’s intention. In this case, the fictionality did not parallel the non-historicity of the text and content. Robert Alter, following Herbert N. Schenidau’s notion of ‘historicized fiction,’ wanted to highlight the difference between ancient and modern historiography.¹⁶¹

A close inspection, however, of the texts that have been passed down to us may lead to a certain degree of skepticism about this scholarly notion of the tyrannical authority of ancient tradition, may lead us, in fact, to conclude that the writers exercised a good deal of artistic freedom in articulating the traditions at their disposal.¹⁶²

For Alter, the role of the biblical writer was not to collect and weave sources and traditions into the text but to have more interpretive roles in delivering traditions. Like rhetorical scholars above insisted, even though Alter never mentioned them, he also highlighted delving into the styles and artistry of literary convention rather than prescribing typical genres and subgenres to the text as Gunkelian form critics did.¹⁶³ Concerning the problem of repetition,¹⁶⁴ -he

¹⁶⁰ Menachem Perry and Meir Sternberg, “The King Through Ironic Eyes: The Narrator’s Devices in the Story of David and Bathsheba and Two Excursuses on the Theory of the Narrative Text,” *Ha-sifrut* 1 (1968), 263-92 (Hebrew). The English version is in Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), 186-229.

¹⁶¹ Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, Revised and Updated (New York: Basic Books, 2011, first published in 1981), 26-7. Herbert N. Schneidau, *Sacred Discontent: The Bible and Western Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 215.

¹⁶² Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 27.

¹⁶³ This goes further to describe biblical authors as “the pioneers of prose fiction in the Western tradition.” Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 61, 195.

suggested instead the concept of type-scene, which he borrowed from Homeric scholarship, to explain how a biblical narrator delivers familiar storytelling-patterns to an audience in various situations¹⁶⁵ by using skills such as dialogue more than narration (ch. 4), repeating leading-word (*Leitwort*) to emphasize particular themes (ch. 5), and keeping silent intentionally instead of describing characters much in plot (ch. 6). Alter proposed that the doublet, while accepting general premises of separable sources,¹⁶⁶ would be considered a narrative strategy that interweaves two different scenes into one plot like a film montage (ch. 7).¹⁶⁷ This approach is reflected in the rising attention to the final form in the mid- and late-twentieth century. Lastly, Alter acknowledged that the narrator in the biblical narrative has an omniscient perspective which is “presumed to know quite literally, what God knows, as on occasion he may remind us by reporting God’s assessments and intentions, or even what He says to Himself” (ch. 8).¹⁶⁸

Meir Sternberg, however, feels that the dichotomy between history and fiction is ambiguous since each term represents a different sphere between the world (the represented object) and the word (the discourse that represents it).¹⁶⁹ This dichotomy “reinforces conceptual fallacy that is potent and widespread enough anyway.”¹⁷⁰ Then he goes on to:

¹⁶⁴ Sternberg introduces four different levels of repetition; 1) levels of sound and linguistic sense; 2) level of plot; 3) thematic level; and 4) generic level. Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 365-6. Although Sternberg never mentioned type-scene, this would be identified as the thematic repetition.

¹⁶⁵ Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 61-2.

¹⁶⁶ Concerning sources of the Tetrateuch, he dated J to the ninth century, E to the ninth and eighth century. He presupposed that P would be started from the First Temple period then continued to the sixth and fifth centuries. DtrH (as the part of the Former Prophet) would be considered the pre-exilic composition. He admitted that Esther and Daniel as post-exilic works. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, xiii, 164.

¹⁶⁷ Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 165, 174-5.

¹⁶⁸ Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 195.

¹⁶⁹ Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 24.

¹⁷⁰ Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 25.

The shift of meaning leads to a symbiosis of meaning, whereby history-writing is wedded to and fiction-writing opposed to factual truth. Now this double identification forms a category-mistake of the first order. For history-writing is not a record of fact-of what "really happened-but a discourse that claims to be a record of fact. Nor is fiction-writing a tissue of free inventions but a discourse that claims freedom of invention. The antithesis lies not in the presence or absence of truth value but of the commitment to truth value.¹⁷¹

In this vein, he dismisses the false dichotomy between history and fiction, source and discourse, fact and nonfact. He criticized Gunkel and Alter both on the grounds that they committed this kind of fallacy when they tried to distinguish "fictional from historiographic writing by their form."¹⁷² Instead, Sternberg tries to focus on the difference between truth value and truth claim in terms of source (true/untrue, probable/improbable), not discourse (historiography/fiction).¹⁷³ Daniel Boyarin well restates his definition as follows: "the Bible as historiography is based on the premise that the truth or falsity of the propositional content of the biblical text is irrelevant for determining whether it is fiction or history-writing."¹⁷⁴

In this vein, Sternberg considers the Bible to be ideological literature: "If the Bible is ideologically singular - and I believe so - then its singularity lies in the world view projected, together with the rhetoric devised to bring it home."¹⁷⁵ Then, Sternberg began to find how an omniscient narrator delivers divine messages to its audiences. His idea of the omniscient narrator

¹⁷¹ Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 25.

¹⁷² Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 26.

¹⁷³ Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 25-26, 30.

¹⁷⁴ Daniel Boyarin, *Sparks of the Logos: Essays in Rabbinic Hermeneutics* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 169.

¹⁷⁵ Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 37. Kevin J. Vanhoozer said, "The Bible is ideological literature insofar as it seeks, through its rhetoric, to shape readers' minds and hearts in order to bring their attitude into alignment with its own." Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge, Anniversary Edition*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009, first published in 1998), 175.

(or narratorial omniscience) is not equated with an author¹⁷⁶ but defined as one who “serves the purpose of staging and glorifying an omniscient God.”¹⁷⁷ Unlike Alter’s idea of an omniscient narrator who is standing above God and humans and dealing with them as literary characters,¹⁷⁸ Sternberg is describing the narrator as a “derivative and second-order authority” to serve an omniscient God and represent divine ideology even though it seems to be a godlike character.¹⁷⁹ This narrator, who builds “the cognitive antithesis between God and humanity into the structure of the narrative,”¹⁸⁰ is exempted from human reality.¹⁸¹

Just as Alter introduced the narrator’s (evaluative and informative) reticence and omission as among the narrative devices, Sternberg, too, developed them in more detail. He brought the concept of gap and gap-filling to describe the interaction between the omniscient narrator and the implied reader. While the narrator refrained from describing the character and its characterization within the plot, this created gaps with ambiguities and ironies.¹⁸² The reader would fill these narrative gaps. The process of gap-filling “enables the implied reader to reconstruct the field of reality devised by the text, to make sense of the represented world.”¹⁸³ Although the implied reader is responsible for filling such an interpretive role, this process of

¹⁷⁶ On Sternberg’s discussion on the Implied author, see Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 75, 430.

¹⁷⁷ Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 89, see also 48, 83, 85, 87, 416.

¹⁷⁸ Sternberg’s description of the Homeric narrator is similar to it. However, Alter did not dismiss that the narratorial omniscience is dependent on divine reference.

¹⁷⁹ Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 89.

¹⁸⁰ He was focusing on the cognitive antithesis between God and Humanity. Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 46.

¹⁸¹ Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 184.

¹⁸² Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 191.

¹⁸³ Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 186.

interpretation is limited within the framework the omniscient narrator provides.¹⁸⁴ In this respect, he considered the purpose of reading biblical text as ideological literature is to persuade the reader. This conclusion resonates with both Gitay and Tribble's work.

1.4. Fourth Generation: Intertextual Approaches

At the beginning of the millennium, Sweeney and Ben Zvi began to re-shape form-critical methods to communicative and intertextual concerns.

Form-critical studies will no longer concern themselves only or mainly with the typical features of language and text. Rhetorical criticism and communication theory have amply demonstrated that the communicative and persuasive functions of texts depend on the unique as well as the typical. Moreover, in considering the rhetorical or communicative aspects of texts, form-critical scholars will no longer presume that genres are static or ideal entities that never change. Rather, they will recognize the inherent fluidity of genres, the fact that they are historically, culturally, and discursively dependent, and they will study the means by which genres are transformed to meet the needs of the particular communicative situation of the text.¹⁸⁵

Concerning the communicative aspects of texts, intertextual approaches explain how the text is interrelated with the other text. Interestingly, intertextual reading varies depending on how a researcher defines the technical terms like work, text, and intertextuality. In biblical studies, the text is usually identified with form, genre, setting, structure, and subject matter within biblical literature and canonical order. Since the poststructural definition of text and intertextuality was introduced and has flourished since the 1960s, there are efforts to search for a way to build a

¹⁸⁴ Sternberg, *The Poetics*, 136, 235. Tony L. Moyers points out "Sternberg warns the reader against subjectively filling in the gaps." Tony L. Moyers, *Reading Responsibly: A Basic Guide to Biblical Interpretation* (Lanham: University Press America, 2016) 147.

¹⁸⁵ Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi, "Introduction" in *The Changing Face* (2003), 9-10.

bridge between biblical texts and actual readers. Marianne Grohmann and Hyun Chul Paul Kim propose two areas of study: inner-biblical intertextuality and post-biblical intertextuality.¹⁸⁶ Tradition-history and redaction critics were attentive to how the text had been developed from a short speech form to a larger literary unit. From this perspective, Fishbane's inner-biblical exegesis project aims to build how written texts had been not just formulated but also reworked by continuous midrashic re-readings of previous texts and traditions.¹⁸⁷ Those approaches focus on redaction, structure, and final-form and are also aligned with this.¹⁸⁸

1.4.1. The Poststructural Rediscovery of Mikhail Bakhtin

Since Mikhail Bakhtin and his circle's dialogism were rediscovered by Julia Kristeva in France in the 1960s, the concept of intertextuality has been reconceptualized. While Saussure abstractly positioned words in their synchronic and paradigmatic relationships, Bakhtin said that the word should be considered within specific social sites, social registers, and moments of utterance and reception.¹⁸⁹

As we reviewed above, structuralistic understanding of the text aims to highlight the linguistic artistry and its system in the text rather than to dig into the author's intention. Russian formalism in the early twentieth century was also positioned in this vein. For example, Vladimir Propp's analysis in 1928 on the old folktale shows that there is a universal structure that shares

¹⁸⁶ Marianne Grohmann and Hyun Chul Paul Kim, "Introduction," in *Second Wave Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Marianne Grohmann and Hyun Chul Paul Kim, RBS 93 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2019), 1-22.

¹⁸⁷ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 6-19.

¹⁸⁸ Sweeney, *TANAK*, 33-36, Also, Sweeney, *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*, FAT 45 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); *Reading Prophetic Books: Form, Intertextuality, and Reception in Prophetic and Post-Biblical Literature*. FAT 89 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

¹⁸⁹ Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*, second edition (New York: Routledge, 2000), 11.

concepts and objects such as seven actants (*dramatis personae*) and thirty-one narrative patterns (*motifemes*).¹⁹⁰ However, Voloshinov/Bakhtin¹⁹¹ criticized two contradicting dialectic trends between individualistic subjectivism (thesis) and abstract objectivism (antithesis) in his contemporary linguistic studies. The former gave too much freedom to the individual's creativity in speech act with his/her independent psyche (Freudian). The latter also strongly believed it is possible to find a universal and normative system of language itself (structuralism, formalism).¹⁹² For him, both approaches neglect the social aspects of language and utterance. In other words, for him, the *Sitz im Leben* of the speaker plays a very crucial role rather than the *Sitz in der Literatur* itself, but this does not mean that he goes back to the original author and its intention. Instead, his highlights of the social aspect of languages relates the reader's active participation by conversation with the text. In this respect, Bakhtin's dialogism aims to overcome the limitation of monologic literature that makes the reader follow what the author or the text provides. That is why he selected Fyodor Dostoevsky's novel as a sample to show how the

¹⁹⁰ Vladimir Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale*, second edition, trans. Svatava Pirkova-Jakobson (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968; originally published in Russian, 1928), 25-65, 84-86. Later, Propp's idea was developed by Algirdas Julien Greimas in 1966. His three pairs of actants (subject-object, helper-opponent, sender-receiver) is based on his structural and semiotic understandings of characters and action. Algirdas Julien Greimas, *Structural Semantics: An Attempt at a Method*, trans. R. Schleifer and D. McDowell (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983; Originally published in French, 1968); Daniel Marguerat and Yvan Bourquin, *How to Read Bible Stories: An Introduction to Narrative Criticism*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1999; Originally published in French, 1998), 62-63.

¹⁹¹ Voloshinov and Medvedev's works are usually ascribed to Bakhtin since the 1970s. Craig Brandist distinguished them from Bakhtin because of "clearly many philosophical, ideological and stylistic discrepancies which, despite the presence of certain parallels and points of agreement." Craig Brandist, "The Bakhtin Circle" in *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://iep.utm.edu/bakhtin/>

¹⁹² Bakhtin/Voloshinov/Medvedev's criticism of Saussurean linguistics, Freudian Psychology, and Russian Formalism, see, Pam Morris, ed. *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. (London: Edward Arnold, 1994), 25-48, 135-160.

double-voice works.¹⁹³ Bakhtin understood that meaning was built on the dynamics of the conversation between the text and the reader and even the characters in the text through the author's writing process.¹⁹⁴ For him, as Graham Allan notes, "all utterances are dialogic, their meaning and logic dependent upon what has previously been said and on how they will be received by others."¹⁹⁵ In this respect, the relationship between I and the other became crucial in the process of reading as meaning-production. It includes the twofold faces of 'I'. Barbara Green said,

So an "I" - Bakhtin calls it *I-for-myself* (I as I look to my self from the inside—inchoate, fluid, and provisional) - moves into relationship with what he calls I-for-the-other (which is how the other appears to me): Only in so doing does the unshaped "I" accept a view that helps me find any sort of edge or limit that is essential for my authoring. I incline toward an other, live into his or her experience. I enter as deeply as I am able the space of the other - their particularity - perceive it to some extent with their eye or ear - and then return to my own space, remembering and marking - integrating - what I have experienced. The twofold trajectory of "empathizing" and then returning makes my insight distinctive.¹⁹⁶

The twofold faces of I expanded his attention to the polyphony of language to sociocultural dynamics in a conversation. This revealed his concept of *heteroglossia*, which means diverse words and expressions of different classes, professions, geographies, and even genders. In Bakhtin's context, the polyphonic language should be "inevitably heteroglossic."¹⁹⁷ Borrowing from the ancient festival's concept of carnival, he described how meaning is

¹⁹³ Morris, ed. *The Bakhtin Reader*, 88-122.

¹⁹⁴ Alexandar Mihailovic, *Corporeal Words: Mikhail Bakhtin's Theology of Discourse* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1997), 53-54.

¹⁹⁵ Allen, *Intertextuality*, 19.

¹⁹⁶ Barbara Green, *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship: An Introduction* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 34.

¹⁹⁷ Green, *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship*, 54.

combined and hybridized in the heteroglossic dialogue of variegated peoples of class and power. In this situation, language would be subversive against the official ideology and state power. Bakhtin calls this phenomenon of the world upside down *carnivalesque* (carnivalization).¹⁹⁸ Graham Allen said, “Carnival, through such images, celebrates the unofficial collective body of the people and stands against the official ideology and discourse of religious and state power.”¹⁹⁹ Therefore, in Bakhtin’s view, the author is no longer the sole bearer of meaning but rather one of the participants building the meaning of the text. The role of the reader is more important than the author. This leads to the proclamatory moment of the death of the author and the birth of the non-passive reader by French literary theorist Roland Barthes.

Roland Barthes understood that “literary meaning can never be fully stabilized by the reader since the literary work’s intertextual nature always leads readers on to new textual relations.”²⁰⁰ He redefined the terms “work” and “text” and reversed the relationship of both. Allen summarized this relationship between work and text well:

In Barthes’s account the traditional terms ‘work’ and ‘text’ are given new definitions. The term ‘work’ now stands where ‘text’ once stood, as the material book offering up the possibility of meaning, of closure and thus of interpretation. The term ‘text’ now stands for the play of the signifier within the work, its unleashing of the disruptive and yet playful force of writing. We should not confuse text and work.²⁰¹

Now the term text occupies the place where the term work once stood. However, the text is not stable because meaning is not fixed in one direction. Jacques Derrida described this

¹⁹⁸ Green, *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship*, 58.

¹⁹⁹ Allen, *Intertextuality*, 22.

²⁰⁰ Allen, *Intertextuality*, 3.

²⁰¹ Allen, *Intertextuality*, 66.

fluctuation of meaning in his newly coined word, *différance*. Even though this word means “difference,” “deferral,” or both, it is hard to define the correct meaning of *différance*.²⁰² However, this term emphasizes the instability of the process of meaning-making. The meaning of the text is produced by the readers of the text. In these points, Barthes distinguished between the reader and the consumers. While consumers signify people “who read the work for stable meaning,” readers signify people “who are productive in their reading, or to put it in Barthes’s terms, are themselves ‘writers’ of the text.”²⁰³

This notion of a productive reader is linked with Kristeva’s concept of textual productivity and intertextuality. She attempted to combine Saussurean and Bakhtian theories of language. She took note of the commodifiable and exchangeable characteristics of communication and meaning.²⁰⁴ Texts are always in a state of production. As Kristeva wrote, a text is “a permutation of texts, an intertextuality: in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another.”²⁰⁵ Allen summarizes Kristeva’s concept of textual productivity and intertextuality well.

The text is a practice and a productivity, its intertextual status represents its structuration of words and utterances that existed before, will go on after the moment of utterance, and so are, in Bakhtin’s terms, “double-voiced.” ... Intertextuality, here, concerns a text’s emergence from the “social text” but also its continued existence within society and history. A text’s structures and meanings are not specific to itself, and to emphasize this point Kristeva views the text, or at least each of its constituent parts, as an ideologeme.²⁰⁶

²⁰² Allen, *Intertextuality*, 65. Jacques Derrida, “Différance” in *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 3-27.

²⁰³ Allen, *Intertextuality*, 70.

²⁰⁴ Allen, *Intertextuality*, 33.

²⁰⁵ Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 36.

²⁰⁶ Allen, *Intertextuality*, 36-37.

Hence, authors “do not create their texts from their own original minds, but rather compile them from pre-existent texts.”²⁰⁷ Instead, the author and the reader both “join a process of continual production.”²⁰⁸ The diminishment of the author and rising of the reader in the text led to Barthes’s proclamation of the death of the author.²⁰⁹ He argued for the multiplicity of writing and plurality of meaning.

This Bakhtinian influence is discovered in James A. Sanders’ idea on the ongoing process of comparative midrash within a certain canonical community.²¹⁰ Daniel Boyarin also, while he was criticizing James Kugel and Jacob Neusner’s author-centered premise on midrash, identified this inner-biblical and midrashic reading practice of ancient interpreters with the modern literary concept of *intertextuality*.

The Torah, owing to its own intertextuality, is a severely gapped text, and the gaps are there to be filled by strong readers, which in this case does not mean readers fighting for originality, but readers fighting to find what they must in the holy text. Their own intertext – that is the cultural codes which enable them to make meaning and find meaning, constrain the rabbis to fill in the gaps of the Torah’s ideological structures...²¹¹

Maxine L. Grossman wrote, “We must recognize that ‘original meaning’ (in the sense of both historical origin and authorial intent) is only a fragment of a much larger picture, whose

²⁰⁷ Allen, *Intertextuality*, 35.

²⁰⁸ Allen, *Intertextuality*, 34.

²⁰⁹ Roland Barthes, “The Death of the Author” in *Image, Music, Text*. trans. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 142-148.

²¹⁰ James A. Sanders, “Intertextuality and Dialogue” *BTB* 29.1 (1999) 35-44; See also, these two works were influenced by Sander’s intertextuality. Yohan Pyeon, *You Have Not Spoken What Is Right about Me: Intertextuality and the Book of Job* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003); Hyun Chul Paul Kim, *Ambiguity, Tension, and Multiplicity in Deutero-Isaiah* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).

²¹¹ Daniel Boyarin, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 16.

ultimate scope is framed all more so by a diversity of audience interpretations and their constructions of textual meanings.”²¹² Thus, I would say that the reader of the biblical text, whether or not it is implied or actual, played a vital role in producing meanings inner-biblically and intertextually.

1.4.2. Mandolfo’s Dialogic Form Criticism

Carleen Mandolf was influenced by Barbara Green,²¹³ Carol A. Newsom,²¹⁴ and John H. Hayes. By building on dialogical theories, Mandolfo pursued a postmodern way to reform and regenerate the form criticism. Basically, her understanding of form criticism began with the expanded knowledge of form and genre by agreeing with the new definition of Sweeney and Ben Zvi. So, she attempted to invite two different theories, those of Gunkel and Bakhtin. Although the two scholars had a different understanding of genre, Mandolf put herself in between dynamics of fixity and fluidity, typicality and uniqueness.²¹⁵ She borrows from Bakhtin’s polyphonic understanding about dialogue/communication, that the meanings of the text are

²¹² Maxine L. Grossman, “Roland Barthes and the Teacher of Righteousness: The Death of the Author of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 718-19.

²¹³ Barbara Green, *How Are the Mighty Fallen? A Dialogical Study of King Saul In 1 Samuel*, LHBOTS 365 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003). Green’s Bakhtinian approaches are followed by these works. Sung Uk Lim, “Jonah’s Transformation and Transformation of Jonah from the Bakhtinian Perspective of Authoring and Re-authoring,” *JSOT* 32.2. (2008), 245-256; EunHee Kang, *The Dialogic Significance of the Sojourner, the Fatherless, and the Widow in Deuteronomy Through an Analysis of Chronotopes Using Bakhtin’s Reading Strategy* (PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2009).

²¹⁴ Carol A. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 3-31.

²¹⁵ Carleen Mandolfo, *Daughter Zion Talks Back to the Prophets: A Dialogic Theology of the Book of Lamentations* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), 55-58.

produced and reproduced throughout the authoring process.²¹⁶ The authoring is a mutual process that shapes both the self and the other. Texts, in this perspective, are always in a fluid state of production. According to Bakhtin's view, the author is no longer the sole bearer of meaning but rather one of the participants, building the meanings of the text. Thus, in the Bakhtinian view, the reader's role is more important than that of the author.

When scholars pay attention to how the vehicle of metaphor functions in a reader's mind, Mandolfo focuses on the cultural 'setting' between the author and the reader (includes the ancient reader and the contemporary reader both). As an actual reader who encounters and interprets the text, Mandolfo stands by the contemporary reader's point of view.²¹⁷ In other words, she attempted to reveal how feminization serves as a vehicle for the master narrative. Following Hilde Lindemann Nelson, she viewed the master narrative as a part of authoritative cultural narratives in that it constructs peoples' identities (worldviews) and their patterns of behavior.²¹⁸ In this respect, she further deconstructed the patriarchal metanarrative of several *Bat Zion* texts (Hos 1-3; Jer 2-3; 13:20-27; Ezek 16, 23) with a feminist lens. She demonstrated how intertextual dialogue between the didactic voice (DV)²¹⁹ and the feminized petitioner works in Lamentation 1-2 polyphonically without any interruption from powers, such as the dominant masculine voice of honor and shame. The narrator's didactic voice is acknowledging the situation the Daughter Zion faces and sympathizing with her, not depending on YHWH's justice

²¹⁶ Mandolfo, *Daughter Zion Talks Back*, 12-19. See also, Green, *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship*, 33-43.

²¹⁷ Mandolfo, *Daughter Zion Talks Back*, 25.

²¹⁸ Mandolfo, *Daughter Zion Talks Back*, 13.

²¹⁹ Her analysis of the didactic voice in the psalms of lament. Mandolfo, *Daughter Zion Talks Back*, 60-64; See also, Mandolfo, *God in the Dock: Dialogic Tension in the Psalms of Lament*, LHBOTS 357 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003).

and righteousness.²²⁰ Nevertheless, while “God never answers the question (though not explicitly Zion’s question) of Lamentations,”²²¹ the subversive voice in Lam 1-2 is faded out by the patriarchal voice in the Deutero-Isaiah, though it is sympathetic (but not empathetic).²²²

Mandolfo’s dialogic form criticism resonates with readers who recognize diverse voices within the biblical texts, even though the point of view of the actual reader is more highlighted. The polyphonic nature of biblical texts makes it hard to excavate the short, self-contained form of the original author. Instead, the Bakhtinian concept of authoring gives a hint that the present form biblical texts had long been composed not by mechanical hands but by interpretive editors. This means that the process of redaction and finalization would be considered as the consequences of re-reading, reception, and reinterpretation.²²³ Further, from a synchronistic point of view, Mandolfo’s research has the potential of reading biblical texts in the context of people who are in liminal space. She problematizes the established tradition that we consider normative, interprets it in her dialogical imagination, and reconstructs a counterstory from a marginal voice. For further research, the marginalized voice should be reviewed with intersectional concerns on gender, race, and class.

²²⁰ Mandolfo, *Daughter Zion Talks Back*, 72-3.

²²¹ Mandolfo, *Daughter Zion Talks Back*, 117.

²²² Critical responses to Mandolfo’s reading of Lam 1-2 by Evangelical female scholars. Mary L. Conway and Kim Lan Nguyen both were objecting to minimizing the reality of sin and punishment. Mark J. Boda, Carol J. Dempsey, and LeAnn Snow Flesher, eds. *Daughter Zion: Her Portraits, Her Response* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 101-26, 269-92, 355-68 (the latter one is Mandolfo’s “talking back”).

²²³ Choon-Leong Seow prefers *consequence* rather than *reception* and *interpretation* because the latter have some passive, limited, and artificial nuances. See C. L. Seow, “C. L. Seow Talks to Michael Law about the Illuminations Commentary,” interview by Michael Law, *Marginalia: The Marginalia Review of Books*, June 18, 2013, <https://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/a-conversation-with-c-l-seow/>. Also, C. L. Seow, *Job 1 - 21: Interpretation and Commentary*, Illuminations (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013), 110.

1.5. Closing Remarks

The development of form criticism has long been via dialogic interaction between biblical and interdisciplinary scholarship. Though the definition has been changed—depending on what the scholars emphasize on typicality or uniqueness, orality or scribalism, passive or active, history or literature, author or text or reader—the primary concerns on typical repetition and unique style are never dismissed. The classical form-critical presumptions of form and genre are indeed considered outdated, but our current scholarship builds upon it. The growing attention to the later stage of development of biblical texts implies that the composition history of the biblical literature could not be defined as the simple dialectic understanding of diachrony and synchrony. Instead, we can create more diverse meanings through the dialogue in the space of in-betweenness. It leads us to give attention to how meanings are produced through continuous re-reading of the text in relation to the relational, dialogic, and intertextual form criticism. Whether the reader is in the past or the present, all kinds of reading could be equivalent to the authoring process. In this respect, it is necessary to review how scholars research the redaction and re-reading within Isa 56-66, the so-called Trito-Isaiah, in the broad boundary of the final form of the Book of Isaiah.

Before we delve into the historical reflection of the re-reading process in Trito-Isaiah, it is necessary to review how scholars have long discussed the formation of Trito-Isaiah in relation to its historical background. The historical development of the linguistic expression and textual forms are very important to understand and reconstruct the formation not only of the Trito-Isaiah and but also of the Book of Isaiah.

Chapter Two

Redaction and Re-reading in Trito-Isaiah

The composition of the Book of Isaiah has long been a subject of discussion among biblical scholars — ever since Duhm's tripartite division was introduced. Scholars generally agree that Isaiah ben Amoz is a historical figure and the second part of the book is related to the period after the fall of Jerusalem, whether it is prescriptive or postscriptive. However, in the case of chapters 56-66, there is no academic agreement because it does not have enough historical clues to infer its *Sitz im Leben* even though it contains developed theological views with enough conceptual affinity to the previous Isaianic traditions in terms of motif and metaphor. Also, the redaction criticism reveals that chapters 56-66 is the collection of various texts in relation to the formation of the final form of the Book of Isaiah. In this respect, the uses of the term Trito-Isaiah are various: to identify the postexilic anonymous prophet, designate the texts as a book or a collection, and call the hypothetical textual unit of chapters 56-66 an academic convenience. With these considerations, this chapter will review how the scholarship has variously dealt with this issue from the perspective of redaction and re-reading.

2.1. Dual Authorship Theory in Late 18th and Early 19th Centuries

Unity and disunity (*Einheitlichkeit und Uneinheitlichkeit*) are main topics in Isaian scholarship. It is true that the idea of dual authorship would trace back to the time before the Enlightenment. The diachronic double division of the Book was already perceived during the High Middle Age and Renaissance periods by Jewish scholars like Abraham Ibn Ezra (1089-

1167).¹ Even the Babylonian Talmud puts Isaiah after Ezekiel in terms of the order of the latter prophets (b. Baba Batra 14b.10).² However, the critical discussion on the historical discontinuity of the Book has flourished since the late eighteenth-century C.E.

The idea of the Book of Isaiah as the collections of oracles (*Orakelsammlung*) was developed among German scholars in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries C.E. Traditionally, the prophetic message came from the prophet himself. During the Enlightenment period, Robert Lowth (1778), an Anglican Bishop, posited that the messages of chapters 40-66 are attributed to the prophet himself in the latter part of King Hezekiah's reign.³ In the German translation of Lowth's work (1779-1781), Johann Benjamin Koppe added his comments that some chapters would not be considered the work of the eighth-century prophet.⁴ Johann Christoph Döderlein, in his second edition in 1780, was identifying chapters 40-66 as the third part of the book.⁵ The idea of dual authorship is found in the third edition in 1788.⁶

¹ Abraham ben Meïr Ibn Ezra, *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*, vol. 1, *Translation of the Commentary*, trans. and ed. M. Friedländer (London: N. Trübner, 1873), 169-70. According to M. Friedländer, although Ibn Ezra was aware of the chronological differences between ch. 39 and ch. 40, he did not argue the dual authorship of it.

² David Sperling, "The Canon, Text, and Editions," *Encyclopedia Judaica*, provided by Jewish Virtual Library. https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/history-of-the-bible#THE_CANON_TEXT_AND_EDITIONS. The Babylonian Talmud also argues for Hezekian authorship: "Hezekiah and his colleagues wrote the following, and a mnemonic to remember which books they wrote is *yod, mem, shin, kuf*: Isaiah [*Yeshaya*], Proverbs [*Mishlei*], Song of Songs [*Shir HaShirim*], and Ecclesiastes [*Kohelet*]" (b. Baba Batra 15a.2). William Davidson, ed. *Babylonian Talmud*, provided by Sefaria. https://www.sefaria.org/Bava_Batra.15a.2?ven=William_Davidson_Edition_-_English&vhe=William_Davidson_Edition_-_Vocalized_Aramaic&lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en.

³ Robert Lowth, *Isaiah: A New Translation with Preliminary Dissertation and Notes* (London: E. Henderson, 1778), 309.

⁴ Uwe Becker, "The Book of Isaiah: Composition History," in *The Oxford Handbook of Isaiah*, ed. Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 39; D. W. Marks, *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions, at the West London Synagogue of British Jews* (London: R. Groombridge and Sons, 1851), 85.

⁵ (1) chs. 1-25; (2) chs. 26-39; (3) chs. 40-66; Johann Christoph Döderlein, *Esaias, ex recensione textus hebraei* (Altorfi: Venum prostat in officina Schuipfeliana, 1780; first edition was published in Latin, 1775, third edition in

Five years before Döderlein's third edition, Joannes Gottfried Eichhorn, in his third volume of *Einleitung* in 1783, suggested that chapters 40-66 should be considered a nameless oracle (*Namenlofen Orakel*) in the later time of Isaiah ben Amoz.⁷ Wilhelm Gesenius developed this idea in 1821. He perceived chapters 40-66 as one large section of the book, although he was proposing it as the fourth part.⁸ However, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette (1817, trans. 1843) considered chapters 40-66 as the second part, which was composed after the exile.⁹

2.2. Duhm's Tripartite Authorship

The term Deutero-Isaiah (*deuterojesaia*) was introduced by Duhm in 1892 (second edition 1902, third edition 1914). Duhm went further to separate Trito-Isaiah (*tritojesaia*) from Deutero-Isaiah by setting up another larger literary unit that includes ch.56 to ch.66. Each author was considered the final author (editor or redactor) responsible for the composition of each final form. Deutero-Isaiah has been identified with the written work of someone living in Lebanon or

1788). John Skinner (1898) was confused that this idea was coming from the 1775 work. John Skinner, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah: Chapters XL-LXVI*, The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1898).

⁶ Ulich Berges, *The Book of Isaiah: Its Composition and Final Form*, HBM 46, trans. Millard Lind (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), 390. Previously published as *Das Buch Jesaja: Komposition und Endgestalt* (Freiburg: Herder, 1998), 556.

⁷ Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, vol. 3 (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1783), 55-56.

⁸ 1) chs. 1-14; 2) chs. 15-25; 3) chs.26-35; and 4) chs.40-66. Chs. 36-39 is considered as a late historical appendix. Wilhelm Gesenius, *Der Prophet Jesaia*, vol. 2 (Leipzig: F. Ch. Willh. 1821), 18-24.

⁹ Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, *A Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament*, vol. 2. trans. Theodore Parker (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1843), 391. = *Lehrbuch der Historisch-Kritischen Einleitung in die Kanonischen und Apokryphischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (1817).

Phoenicia around 540 B.C.E.¹⁰ That writer was also responsible for inserting and modifying four different servant songs (*Ebed-Jahve-Lieder*; *EJL*) into his work.¹¹

The author of Trito-Isaiah was identified as one who depended on the theocratic system around the Second Temple in Jerusalem, at the time the Samaritans were challenging it, in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah (esp. before Nehemiah's arrival in 445 B.C.E.). Duhm described Trito-Isaiah as having the same spirit (*denselben Geist*) as Ezekiel. Duhm also locates chs. 36-39 in this period.¹²

Duhm considers that the final composition of chs. 40-66 was formed by someone living in the time of the Chronicler and it could be divided into three subsets. He based this on the formulaic statements in 48:22 and 57:21. Duhm perceived the distinction between chs. 40-48 and chs. 49-55 within the structure of Deutero-Isaiah. Although Duhm did not mention who was responsible for inserting this formulaic statement into the preface to the second edition, he noted that the author or the composer of Trito-Isaiah was responsible for it.¹³ Though, in his first edition, Duhm said the final composer of chs. 40-66 would not be identical with Trito-Isaiah,¹⁴ he changed his position in the second edition.¹⁵ The final form of the Book of Isaiah in its final

¹⁰ According to Kristin Joachimsen, Duhm characterizes Deutero-Isaiah more like a poet than a prophet. Kristin Joachimsen, *Identities in Transition: The Pursuit of Isa. 52:13-53:12*, VTSup 142 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 19n23.

¹¹ Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, xiii, xviii.

¹² Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, xviii-xix.

¹³ Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, 330, 395, 406.

¹⁴ "...zeigt einige Verwandtschaft mit dem Vf. von c. 56-66, ist aber wahrscheinlich nicht mit ihm identisch..." Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, 1st ed., HKAT III,1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892), xiii.

¹⁵ Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, 2nd ed., xiii.

form was completed in the third century¹⁶ or second century B.C.E.¹⁷ with some miscellaneous eschatological insertions such as chs. 24-27 and chs. 33-35.

Therefore, 1) Duhm's program, influenced by the History of Religion School, makes it clear that the redactional process that led to the final form was developed over a period of years. 2) Unlike what Gunkel and subsequent form critics did later, Duhm did not posit the etiological concerns with the oral transmission with before the written text. He did not have much interest in finding the original message of the prophet himself. 3) Also, he considered each book to have originated independently, not dependent on one another. His idea is rooted in a critical view on the mechanical redactor. 4) Finally, concerning the authorship of the composition, he preferred to regard it as having a single, not a collective author.

Karl Marti (1900) accepted Duhm's basic premises of the composition of the Book of Isaiah. He considered each book to have been written by a different prophet. He hesitated to set the specific location of Deutero-Isaiah between Lebanon (Duhm) and Egypt (Ewalds, Bunsens). Rather, he suggested that this anonymous author would be well known not only during the Babylonian exile, but also in the Egyptian diaspora. Concerning Trito-Isaiah, he agreed with Duhm's proposal of the authorship by a mid-fifth century prophet in Jerusalem between 458 B.C.E. (Ezra's arrival) and 445 B.C.E. (Nehemiah's first arrival).¹⁸ It is true that, as Duhm did, Marti also considered the Samaritans and their syncretic cult to be problematic against the

¹⁶ Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, 2nd ed., xiv.

¹⁷ Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, second edition (1902), xxi.

¹⁸ Karl Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja*, KHAT 10 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1900), xv, xxii.

Temple-centered society in Judah during this period.¹⁹ In this vein, Trito-Isaiah has a connection with Deutero-Isaiah and Ezekiel.²⁰

2.3. Reconsideration of Duhm's Theory in the First Half of the 20th Century

Duhm's tripartite model was redesigned by early and mid-twentieth century scholars, resulting in a variety of models. These developmental changes included divergent theories of authorship and disagreements of the dating of Trito-Isaiah.

2.3.1. Dependency on Previous Isaian Tradition

First, Duhm's idea of independent authorship was revisited. Since Gunkel and his followers were focused on the oral transmission behind the textual history, the idea on the single authorship of each source was also revisited. Gunkel perceived that the eighth-century prophets had writing skills to deliver prophetic messengers (Isa 10, Jer 36) by influencing previous short speech forms.²¹ The debates around the plural authorship of the Isaianic documents are based not only on the questions of the authenticity of the prophetic speeches, whether attributed to Isaiah ben Amoz or his followers. Rather, the debates go further, questioning whether and how the later works of prophetic circles or schools depended on earlier prophetic speeches and traditions.

While accepting the single original authorship of First and Second Isaiah in the cultic context, Mowinckel (1925, 1927, 1930, 1931, 1946) presupposed the plural authorship in his observation of Isa 8:16. The Isaianic disciples (*Jüngerkreis*) in the pre- and post-exilic periods

¹⁹ Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 367, 390, 397.

²⁰ Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja*, xxii.

²¹ Gunkel. "The Prophet as Writers and Poets," 29.

would be for the composition of each book as a collection and redaction.²² The four servant songs in Deutero-Isaiah should be attributed to the authors of Trito-Isaiah, which would be the disciples of Deutero-Isaiah, not from an individual's psychology (1928, 31).²³ Ernest Sellin (1933)²⁴ and Karl Elliger (1933, 1978)²⁵ both presupposed that the author of the fourth servant song would be Trito-Isaiah. Otto Procksch (1930) and Douglas R. Jones (1955) also discussed the textual evidence of Isaian disciples from Isa 8:16 about Jer 26.²⁶

Robert H. Pfeiffer (1941) mentioned that the purpose of Trito-Isaiah is “to interpret the Second Isaiah for a later generation.”²⁷ Walther Zimmerli (1950) considered 57:14-63:7 to be the main body (*Hauptmasse*), which was originally delivered by Trito-Isaiah who transformed the languages of Deutero-Isaiah into its abstract and spiritual nuances.²⁸ Werner Kessler (1960) described Trito-Isaiah as the preacher (*des Predigers*) who was influenced by Deutero-Isaiah.²⁹

²² Sigmund Mowinckel, *Profeten Jesaja* (Oslo: Aschehoug, 1925); *Jesaja-disiplene* (Oslo: Aschehoug, 1926); “Die Komposition des Jesajabuches, Kap. 1-39.” *Acta Orientalia* 11 (1933), 267-292.

²³ Sigmund Mowinckel, “Die Komposition der deuterojesajanischen Buches” *ZAW* 49 (1931), 251-2, 4.

²⁴ Ernst Sellin, “Tritojesaja, Deuterojesaja und das Gottesknechtproblem” *NKZ* 41 (1930), 73-93, 145-73.

²⁵ Karl Elliger, *Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933); *Deuterojesaja* (Neukirchen-Vluyn : Neukirchener Verlag, 1978).

²⁶ Otto Procksch, *Jesaja I*, KAT 9 (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1930), 138-140; Douglas R. Jones, “The Tradition of the Oracles of Isaiah of Jerusalem” *ZAW* 67 (1955), 226-246.

²⁷ Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941), 480.

²⁸ Walther Zimmerli, “Zur Sprache Tritojesaja” in *Gottes Offenbarung; gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*. (München: C. Kaiser, 1963), 217-33, Originally published in *Schweizerische theologische Umschau* 20 (1950), 110-22. However, Michael Fishbane (1985) was criticizing that, “However, as Zimmerli himself concedes, there is no fixed way in which Trito-Isaiah reused his putative *traditum*, which raises the possibility that the snippets of so-called literal and free ‘citations’ are merely the shared phraseology of a school tradition. Moreover, even if Trito-Isaiah studied Deutero-Isaiah’s language, and built upon it, the transformations of usage in the later sources need not derive from any deliberate exegetical intent. Rather, a learned vocabulary may simply have been reapplied by later prophetic tradents in accordance with new tastes and circumstances; so that nothing would be proved with respect to the existence of deliberate *exegetical* revision in the cases in question.” Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 289.

²⁹ Werner Kessler, *Gott geht es um das Ganze: Jesaja 56-66 und Jesaja 24-27* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960), 17-19.

P. -E. Bonnard (1972) also considers that the writer of Isa 56-66 would be considered the disciple of the Second Isaiah.³⁰ Thinking of the complex ongoing redactional stages opens the gate to consideration of the composition of the Book of Isaiah.

2.3.2. Dating of Trito-Isaiah

Duhm's dating of Trito-Isaiah has also been reconsidered. Thomas Kelly Cheyne in 1895 preferred to identify Chs. 56-66 as the second part of Deutero-Isaiah while admitting its literary unity. However, he agreed with Duhm's basic concept of composition and dating except for the case of 63:7-64:1. His dating of this verse was predicated on Artaxerxes III Ochus (r.358-338 B.C.E.)³¹, not Antiochus IV Epiphanes (r.175-164 B.C.E.), because of Josephus's account on his general Bagoas's persecution against Jews (*Ant.* XI:297-301). Noah Calvin Hirschy (1909), following Cheyne's thesis, was trying to connect Isaian texts and the Persian period, especially Ochus's reign.³² However, this theory failed to carefully, and critically, deal with secondary accounts.

Charles C. Torrey (1928) tried to detach Cyrus and Babylon/Chaldea from chs. 34-35, 40-66 while considering the coherent literary unit. Reference to Cyrus in 44:28 and 45:1 would be regarded as later interpolations by a writer from the fifth century B.C.E. In this respect, he

³⁰ Pierre-Émile Bonnard, *Le Second Isaïe: Son Disciple et Leurs Éditeurs Isaïe 40-66* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1972), 316-7.

³¹ Thomas K. Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah: With an Appendix Containing the Undoubted Portions of the Two Chief Prophetic Writers in a Translation* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1895), xxxi, 156, 358ff.

³² Noah Calvin Hirschy, *Artaxerxes III Ochus and His Reign: With Special Consideration of the Old Testament Sources Bearing Upon the Period*. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909).

read that the conqueror in 41:1-5 would be Abraham, not Cyrus.³³ Later, James D. Smart (1964) accepted Torrey's premise with his modification. He considered chs. 35, 40-66 as a coherent unit which was written by an anonymous prophet called Second Isaiah after the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E. Regarding Cyrus, as Torrey did, he presupposed that it was attributed to a later editor in the fifth century.³⁴ Lisbeth S. Fried (2002), however, considered the writer of chs. 40-55 to be the contemporary of King Cyrus because he legitimized him as the heir to the Davidic throne during the Persian Period, not the Babylonian Period.³⁵ As Joseph Blenkinsopp (2015) points out, though we can guess the intertextual relationship to the late date of the Abraham tradition, there is "no doubt that in 41:2-5 the prophet had in mind the Persian Cyrus II."³⁶

Karl Eliiger (1928) accepted Duhm's basic premise of trichotomy and single authorship but presupposed that the author would be one of the disciples of Deutero-Isaiah. He reconsidered the various dates proposed by previous scholars and instead proposed that the composition of Trito-Isaiah by a single author occurred from 538 to 500, but primarily around 520-515 at the time of the construction of the Second Temple.³⁷

³³ Charles Cutler Torrey, *The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), viii, 40-44, 357; "Isaiah 41," *HTR* 44 (1951), 121-36.

³⁴ James D. Smart, *History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40-66* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 24-25, 30-33, 115-34.

³⁵ Lisbeth S. Fried, "Cyrus the Messiah? The Historical Background to Isaiah 45:1" *HTR* 95.4 (2002), 374.

³⁶ Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Abraham and Cyrus in Isaiah 40-48," in *New Perspectives on Old Testament Prophecy and History: Essays in Honour of Hans M. Barstad*, ed. Rannfrid I. Thelle, Terje Stordalen, and Mervyn E. J. Richardson, VTSup 168 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 33-34.

³⁷ See his table in Karl Elliger, *Die Einheit des Tritojesaia (Jesaia 56-66)*, (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928), 116-17; Brooks Schramm, *The Opponents of Third Isaiah: Reconstructing the Cultic History of the Restoration*, JSOTSup 193 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 16-17.

...Statt aller Präludien sei gleich die These an den Anfang gestellt: die 13 Stücke von c. 56-66 stammen alle aus der Schaffenszeit eines Mannes; terminus a quo ist das Jahr 538, terminus ad quem etwa 500; Trijes. wirkt also ± 520 .³⁸

Duhm and Elliger's theory of single authorship, by an anonymous prophet called Trito-Isaiah, was also found in W. S. McCullough (1948), but his Trito-Isaiah was written by the Palestine Prophet after the fall of Jerusalem in 587-562 B.C.E. Douglas R. Jones (1964) and W. L. Holladay (1978) also dealt with Trito-Isaiah as a single author within the context of temple reconstruction.³⁹

2.4. Multiple Authorship and Dating of Trito-Isaiah until the 1970s

Paul Volz (1932)⁴⁰, however, rejected the single authorship, but the redactional unity was still acknowledged. He proposed chs.56-66 as the collections written by various individuals over time, not by a single hand. This debate around the number of authorships is related to how they dated each part of Trito-Isaiah. Georg Fohrer (1964; 1965 → trans. 1968)⁴¹ also subscribes to this idea of multiple authorship.

Der Dritte Jesaja ist nicht ein einziger Prophet gewesen; vielmehr handelt es sich um eine ganze Reihe von unbekannten Propheten oder Verfassern, deren Worte in dieser Schrift gesammelt worden sind.⁴²

³⁸ Elliger, *Die Einheit des Tritojesaja*, 76.

³⁹ Douglas R. Jones, *Isaiah 56-66 and Joel* (London: SCM Press, 1964), 19-30; W. L. Holladay, *Isaiah: Scroll of a Prophetic Heritage* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 163, 171. He was influenced by Hanson's 1975 work.

⁴⁰ Paul Volz, *Jesaja II*, KAT 9/2 (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1932), 196-202.

⁴¹ Georg Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja: 3 Band, Kapitel 40-66* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1964), 12-14; *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1968; originally published in 1965), 388.

⁴² Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja: 3 Band, Kapitel 40-66*, 13.

Otto Eissfeldt (1934) was trying to hybridize Duhm-Elliger and Volz. He admitted that most of what is in the collection of chs. 56-66 was written by an anonymous author in 520-516 who was a disciple of Deutero-Isaiah, but some part was transmitted from an earlier time or was added later.⁴³ W. Kessler (1956) also considered the possibility that, except for the cases of 56:2-7 and 66:16-24, the writing belonged to the times of Ezra and Nehemiah, while the rest of these chapters was delivered after the dedication of the temple in 515 and the probable late year of Malachi in 475 B.C.E.⁴⁴

This idea is also found in more complicated forms in the 1960s-70s: Claus Westermann (1966 → trans. 1969)⁴⁵, Karl Pauritsch (1971)⁴⁶, R. N. Whybray (1975)⁴⁷, J. Alberto Soggin (1974, 66 → trans. 1976, 1980)⁴⁸, and Paul D. Hanson (1975 → revised. 1979)⁴⁹. For example, Whybray acknowledged that the material in chs. 56-66 is “a conscious re-interpretation of the themes and words of Deutero-Isaiah,” and its historical context would be related to Ezra 1-6, Hag., and Zech. 1-8.⁵⁰ Meanwhile, he also noticed that chs. 56-66 had been redacted and reinterpreted in the course of history. He said,

⁴³ Otto Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament: unter Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen. Entstehungsgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen: JCB Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1934), 387.

⁴⁴ Werner Kessler, “Zur Auslegung von Jesaja 56-66” *ThLZ* 81 (1956), 335-338; “Studie zur religiösen Situation im ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert und zur Auslegung von Jesaja 56-66,” *WZ(H)* 6.1 (1956/57) 41-73.

⁴⁵ Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*, OTL. trans. D. M. G. Stalker (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969; originally published in German, 1966), 296-308.

⁴⁶ Karl Pauritsch, *Die neue Gemeinde: Gott sammelt Ausgestossene und Arme (Jesaja 56-66)* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971), 219-26.

⁴⁷ R. N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66*, NCBC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975) 38-43.

⁴⁸ J. Alberto Soggin, *Introduction to the Old Testament: From Its Origins to the Closing of the Alexandrian Canon*, revised edition (London: SCM Press, 1980; originally published in Italian, 1974 revised version in 1980), 336-7.

⁴⁹ Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*, revised edition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979; first published in 1975), 32-208, 388-401.

⁵⁰ Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66*, 39.

A comparison of the different units leads to the conclusion that their diversity is too great for them to be the work of one man. ...but in the other passages the prophetic form seems to hide some other function such as that of preacher or the exegete, though the distinction between the genuinely prophetic and the 'quasi-prophetic' is not easy to make. Some material, moreover, is clearly not prophetic but liturgical (59:9-15a; 63:7-64:12). The precise situation presupposed also seems to be not always the same. There are a number of passages which are best explained as the result of a continuous process of interpretation, re-interpretation and expansion.⁵¹

As we discussed in the previous chapter, Westermann's method was rooted in his progressive understanding of how form and genre grew from the short self-contained speech form to a larger format. Therefore, the form and redactional strands that he identifies in Trito-Isaiah can be divided into four parts: 1) *ipsissima verba* (original words or speeches of the prophet himself) of message of restoration and salvation to his fellow community (core: chs. 60-62, framework: chs. 59 and 63/64, unconnected: 57:14-20; 65:16b-25; 66:6-16; and perhaps 58:1-12); 2) announcement of judgement against individuals (JI) (56:9-57:13; 57:21; 59:2-8; 65:1-16a; 66:3f; 66:5, 17); 3) announcement of judgement against nations (JN) (60:12; 63:1-6; 66:6, 15f; 66:30, 22f, apocalyptic: 60:19f; 65:17, 25; 66:20, 22ff); 4) oracle of salvation to the gentiles (bookends 56:1f, 3-8; 66:18f, 21; keeping Sabbath: 66:1f).⁵²

Pauritsch was more concerned with the redactor's activity than with the responsibility of the author himself. Interestingly, he placed this redactor in the circumstance of temple reconstruction, while he did not identify him with the prophet himself or the author. For example, he considered ch.60-62 and 56:1-8 as both redactional, but he dated them in 520 and

⁵¹ Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66*, 42.

⁵² Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 307.

515.⁵³ However, as Sekine and Tiemeyer pointed out, he did not provide a specific explanation for his decision.⁵⁴

Hanson focused on the apocalyptic traits of Trito-Isaiah, with his form-critical and sociological analysis on the conflicts between Zadokite priests and Levitical visionaries. On the bookends in 56:1-8 and 66:17-24, he presupposed that these functioned as the framework but were redacted by a later apocalyptic and visionary community who was a contemporary of Deutero-Zechariah (according to Hanson, Zech. 9-14).

2.4.1. 63:7-64:11; 60-62; 63:1-6

Table 1. Various Dating of Chs. 60-62, 63-64 until the 1970s⁵⁵

	K.Elliger (1928)	P.Volz (1932)	O.Eissfeldt (1934)	G.Fohrer (1964, 1965 → 1968)	C.Westermann (1966 → 1969)	K.Pauritsch (1971)	R.N.Whybray (1975)	J.A.Soggin (1974,77 → 76,80)	P.Hanson (1975 → 1979)
60-62	519-515 (ch.61: 515)	early post-exilic (except ch.61: 5th c?)	520-516	early post-exilic	537-521 (except 60:12, 19-20)	520	538-516	521-520	early post-exilic
63:1-6	538-519	500-450	520-516	post-exilic, not precisely datable	later	apocalyptic	538-516	apocalyptic, impossible to date	contemporary with 60-62
63:7-64:11	538-519	c.585	soon after 587	mid 6th c. (the earliest)	537-521	587	mid-exilic	late exilic	early post-exilic

⁵³ Pauritsch, *Die neue Gemeinde*, 221-22, 243.

⁵⁴ Seizo Sekine, *Die Tritojesajanische Sammlung (Jes 56-66) redaktionsgeschichtlich untersucht*, BAZW 175 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1989), 80-84; Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage: Post-Exilic Prophetic Critique of the Priesthood*, FAT 2.19 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 66.

⁵⁵ Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, 458; Schramm, *The Opponents*, 16-20. With some fixations of Schramm's summary.

For Elliger, 63:1-64:11 is the oldest text within the Trito-Isaiah. He presupposed the temple reconstruction and dedication in 519-515 would be the setting of chs. 60-62. Westermann and Hanson were following the late sixth century dating as Elliger did. Soggin's program generally followed Elliger, but he was hesitant to date 63:1-6 because of its apocalyptic nature.

Meanwhile, Volz suggested that chs. 60 and 62 both came from the early post-exilic period,⁵⁶ but 63:7-64:11 was earlier in the context of the fall of Jerusalem. Volz's dating was found in Eissfeldt and Pauritsch. Pauritsch proposed the original sequence of 61:1-9, 11, 62:1-9, and 60:1-22 with the prophet's genuine writing in 62:10. This sequence was reordered into the present one by the redactor's hand later in 520.⁵⁷

Fohrer was in the middle of them. He posted 63:7-64:11 in the middle of the sixth century as the earliest text of the Trito-Isaiah, and chs.60-62 in the early post-exilic period. Whybray also considered that 63:7-64:11 was "probably composed in Palestine during the exilic period and incorporated into work."⁵⁸

Concerning 63:1-6, Elliger, Eissfeldt, Whybray, Soggin, and Hanson prefer to put it in the context of the temple reconstruction. Volz put it in 500-450, before the arrival of Ezra (458, if the Persian king in Ezra 7:7 would be considered Artaxerxes I) and the first arrival of Nehemiah (445, Neh 2:1). Meanwhile, Westermann and Pauritsch did not consider that it was written by the same author of chs. 60-62 because of its apocalyptic nature.

⁵⁶ The so-called fifth servant song in ch.61 (although *ebed* is not mentioned in the text) was considered as the later insertion in the fifth century. Volz, *Jesaja II*, 253-260. (255) Unlike Volz, most scholars regarded chs.60-62 as one single unit written by a single author. This is also found in J. Fischer, *Das Buch Isaias II* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1939), 171, 178.

⁵⁷ Pauritsch, *Die neue Gemeinde*, 221, 222.

⁵⁸ Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66*, 42.

2.4.2. Chs. 56-59

Table 2. Various Dating of Chs. 56-59 until the 1970s

	K.Elliger (1928)	P.Volz (1932)	O.Eissfeldt (1934)	G.Fohrer (1964; 65→68)	C.Westermann (1966 → 1969)	K.Pauritsch (1971)	R.N.Whybray (1975)	J.A.Soggin (1974,77 → 76,80)	P.Hanson (1975 → 1979)
56:1-8	not long after 515	5th c.?	520-516	early part of 5th c.	Later	515	538-516	521-520	redactional, 475-425 (similar to Zech 14)
56:9-57:13	later, but before 500	pre-exilic	57:1-13: before 587	beginning of 5th c.	pre-exilic (except v.1-2)	520	538-516	(pre-) exilic 57:1-13: agree with Eissfeldt.	520
57:14-21	519-515	5th c.?	520-516	post- exilic, not precisely datable	537-521	v.14-19: 515 v.20-21: later hand,	538-516	v.14-19: 521-520	early post- exilic
58:1-12	not long after 515	5th c.?	520-516	post- exilic, not precisely datable	537-521	early post- exilic	soon after 538	521-520	early post- exilic
58:13-14	not long after 515	5th c.?	520-516	post- exilic, not precisely datable	later	early post- exilic	soon after 538	521-520	

59:1-21	not long after 515 v.15b-19: little later?	v.1-3: early post exilic v.9ff: 5th c?	520-516	5th c.	v.2-8: later	no date	v.9-15a: liturgical	v.1-15a: 521-520 v.15b-20: cannot be dated	early post- exilic
---------	---	--	---------	--------	-----------------	---------	------------------------	--	--------------------------

Volz considered most parts of chs. 56-59 to have come from the fifth century, not the sixth century. His dating is closer to Duhm's theory than Elliger's. This tendency is also found in Forher's program on 56:1-8, 56:9-57:13 and 59:1-12. He presupposed that this addressor, who Deutero-Isaiah influenced, played his role to solve the delay of eschatological salvation after the completion of the new Temple.⁵⁹

Volz's dating of 56:9-57:13 is extraordinary in comparison to others. He dated this text in the pre-exilic period, especially at the end of Hezekiah and the beginning of Manasseh in the early seventh century BCE. This idea appeared in Samuel David Luzziano's suggestion in *Sefer Yesha'yahu* (1855-67), although Volz did not mention him.⁶⁰ Westermann also noticed that 56:9-57:13 is very similar to the announcements of judgment in pre-exilic prophets. But he presupposes that this would be a later reception and revisions against the transgressors in the post-exilic community.⁶¹ Whybray also pointed out that,

There is nothing here which compels a pre-exilic date: the sins condemned are not exclusively characteristic of any one period, and there is no proof that such unrelieved prophecies of disaster cannot have been pronounced after the Exile...⁶²

⁵⁹ Forher, *Introduction*, 368.

⁶⁰ Shmuel Vargon, "Isaiah 56:9-57:13: Time of the Prophecy and Identity of the Author. According to Samuel David Luzzatto" *JSQ* 6.3 (1999), 228, 230.

⁶¹ Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 302.

⁶² Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66*, 199.

Except for Volz, most parts of chs. 56-59 were rendered as works after the fall of Babylon by Cyrus II in 539 until the dedication of the Second Temple in 515, without some cases of later redactional additions. Eissfeldt, Whybray, and Soggin considered that 56:1-8, 57:14-21, 58:1-12, 58:13-14, and beginning parts of ch. 59, would be placed in the context of the late sixth century B.C.E. Elliger and Hanson's program is not far from this idea. For Elliger, these texts were composed not long after 515. Hanson generally dates the rest of the texts in chs. 56-59 in the late sixth century B.C.E. except for 56:1-8. He considered 56:1-8 as within the redactional framework with 66:18-24 by the later editor who shared the idea with Deutero-Zechariah.⁶³ As Brooks Schramm points out, although Hanson did not give a definite date except for 66:1-6, the parameters of his dating would be "from approximately 530 to approximately 500."⁶⁴ Pauritsch also preferred to post chs. 56-59 within the context of 520-515. However, his view of the work of 520-515 is closer to that of a redactor, not an author. For him, 56:1-8 functions as the theological motto of universalism within the Trito-Isaiah as his subtitle implies "*Gott sammelt Ausgestossene und Arme.*"⁶⁵

Concerning 56:9-57:13, especially the case of 57:1-13, Soggin generally agreed with Eissefeldt's pre-exilic dating, although he hesitated to provide definite proposals. The contents of this text are very similar to syncretic liturgies occurring in Jerusalem (Ezek 8) and Egypt (Jer 43-44, Elephantine Papyrus) before and after 587/6.⁶⁶

⁶³ Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 388-401.

⁶⁴ Schramm, *The Opponents*, 19.

⁶⁵ Pauritsch, *Die neue Gemeinde*, 243.

⁶⁶ Soggin, *Introduction*, 338.

2.4.3. Chs. 65-66

Table 3. Various Dating of Chs. 65-66 until the 1970s

	K.Elliger (1928)	P.Volz (1932)	O.Eissfeldt (1934)	G.Fohrer (1964, 1965 → 1968)	C.Westermann (1966 → 1969)	K.Pauritsch (1971)	R.N.Whybray (1975)	J.A.Soggin (1974,77 → 76,80)	P.Hanson (1975 → 1979)
65:1-25	Later, but before 500	Hellenistic	400-200	4th c.	v.1-16a, v.16b-25: 537-521	520	v.17,25: eschatological, one or two c. later than main part	(pre-)exilic	early post- exilic
66:1-24	Later, but before 500	v.1f: c.520 v.3f, 17, 5f, 7-24: Hellenistic	v.1-4: before 538	v.1-4: 520 v.5-24: 3rd c.	v.6-16 537-521 v.3f, 6, 15f v.18f, 21 v.20, 20f: later	v.1-4: 520 v.6-16: 515	v.1-2.: near 520 v.6, 15- 23: eschatological, one or two c. later than main part v.24: later 3rd or early 2nd c.	v.1-2a: before 520 v.3-17: 521-520 v.18-24: redactional	v.1-16: 520 v.18-24: redactional, 475-425 (similar to Zech 14)

On 65:1-25, except Soggin, most scholars were standing on post-exilic dating. Elliger, Pauritsch, Westermann, and Hanson prefer to put it in the context of before-and-after temple construction in the late sixth century. Whybray generally agreed with them except for the cases of vv. 17 and 25 because of their eschatological traits. He suggested that these verses would be one or two centuries later than the rest of the chapter. Meanwhile, Volz, Eissfeldt, and Fohrer favored a later dating. For example, Fohrer put it in the context of the fourth century because

names of feminine deities, Gad and Meni, in v.11 would be related to the Nabateans' cult.⁶⁷ Lastly, Soggin observed this text was rooted in (pre-)exilic syncretic circumstances as he also noted in regard to 56:9-57:13.

Most scholars generally agree that the beginning verses of chs.66 came from the late fifth century, whether or not they determine its boundary from v.1 to v.2 or v.4, or even v.16. For example, though Soggin hesitated to date 66:1-2a, he thought that this text might be earlier than 521-20 because it contains the polemic against the temple reconstruction, which Haggai and Zechariah delivered. In this vein, "Duhm's argument that this is a criticism of the building of the Samaritan temple certainly cannot be sustained."⁶⁸ Volz considered that 66:3f, 5f, 17, 7-24 with ch. 65 as the work of the Hellenistic period because its cult in these texts (esp. v.17) reminds "the mystagogue of the Eleusinian mysteries of the *pater patrum* of the Mithraic circle."⁶⁹ Fohrer also suggested that vv. 5-24 came from the third century, but he did not note anything analogous with any ancient Greco-Roman cultic practices with the text.

⁶⁷ Forher, *Introduction*, 387. Authur Weiser, as Volz did, put ch. 65 and 66:3f in the Hellenistic time because "the attack on the deities Gad (Fortune) and Meni (Destiny) seems to have gained greater influence and customs are contemplated probably belonging to the practices of the mysteries which were beginning to spread at that time." Authur Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*. trans. Dorothea M. Barton. (New York: Association Press, 1961; translated from the fourth edition in German, 1957), 207. However, the recent study proposes that the name Gad would be considered as the epithet of El, the pre-Hellenistic deity, not as the independent deity or as the personification of fortune and fate. Ryan Thomas, "The God Gad" *JAOS* 139.2. (2019), 307-316.

⁶⁸ Soggin, *Introduction*, 337.

⁶⁹ Volz, *Jesaia II*, 292. Originally, cites from G. J. Botterweck, "*chazir*" in *TDOT*, vol. IV (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974), 298.

2.5. Shift to Later Scribal Traditions

Scholars holding the theory of multiple authorship of Trito-Isaiah were still trying to discern the original voice of an anonymous prophet or prophetic circle belonging to the Isaian Tradition by asserting the previous or later additions. Westermann's form-critical commentary is a good example of this. Scholarly interests have shifted from identifying the original authorship/s (or speech form/s) in the certain historical context to focusing on the hermeneutical contributions of later hands in the process of composition and finalization. Otto Kaiser's short article on chs. 56-66 in his *Introduction* (1973 → 1975) clearly shows this shift. He considered chs. 56-66 to be a collection rather than a book. So, he called it the "Trito-Isaianic Collection." Most scholars, including Volz, Eissfeldt, Fohrer, and Pauritsch, have identified 63:7-64:11 as the oldest pre-exilic text before the time of Deutero-Isaiah. The remainder of the texts were regarded as the works of the post-exilic period. Although Kaiser admitted that Deutero-Isaiah would influence the rest, he was hesitant to provide specific dates for each redactional block. Even on the Trito-Isaiah central block (57:14-20; 60-62; 65:16b-19a and 66:7-14), which he considered the first redactional stages of the Trito-Isaianic Collection, he presupposed a later composition rather than his other contemporaries. He put it as early as the period before Nehemiah. This theory aligns with Duhm's dating. Kaiser states the issue as follows:

...it appears to me that the assumption that the material in Trito-Isaiah originated in the sixth century is laden with difficulties, because it must be agreed with Michel that the period of scriptural exposition begins with this material. It is questionable whether they can even be dated as early as the period before Nehemiah.⁷⁰

⁷⁰ Otto Kaiser, *Introduction to the Old Testament: A Presentation of its Results and Problems*, trans. John Sturdy (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Press, 1975; translated from the revised edition in 1973, originally published in German, 1969), 271.

Kaiser disagreed with theories that advanced either a single author or multiple authors who were linked with each particular *Sitz im Leben*. Rather, he followed the tradition-historical suggestion of tradent-prophecy (*Tradenten-prophezie*).⁷¹ Tradition-historical critics—such as Walther Zimmerli (1950), Diethelm Michel (1965-6), and later David L. Peterson (1977)⁷² were more interested in focusing on one who had the interpretive scribal role as a result of re-reading the previous Isaianic traditions rather than one who had written original messages that came from himself. Kaiser presupposed that this scribal exposition was developed later than the late sixth century. This interest in the later scribal hands had been developed by Klaus Koenen (1987), Marvin A. Sweeney (1988), Odil Hannes Steck (1991), Wolfgang Lau (1994), and Seizo Sekine (1999). It will be discussed in 2.8.

⁷¹ Annette Schellenberg provides a fine definition of this term: “To express the idea that the writings of these theologians are as important as the words of the original prophets, scholars have coined terms such as ‘prophetic exegesis of the prophets’ (‘Prophetische Prophetenauslegung’) and ‘tradent prophecy’ (‘Tradentenprophezie’). More common (though only in German) is the term ‘literary prophecy’, which has the advantage of referring not only to redactional additions to older prophetic words but also to texts that originated without an original oral prophet (as discussed, e.g., in the cases of Jonah, Joel, and Malachi).” Annette Schellenberg, “An Anti-Prophet among the Prophets? On the Relationship of Jonah to Prophecy” *JSOT* 39.3 (2015), 364-5.

⁷² Walther Zimmerli (1950), Diethelm Michel (1965-6) and later David L. Peterson (1977). Peterson later, following Zimmerli and Michel, more clearly states as follow: “The attitude toward the word of Yahweh and the indications of an exegetical enterprise in Trito-Isaiah suggest that we are now dealing with traditionalists, preservers, and interpreters of authoritative traditions, rather than innovators in the use of Israel’s religious past.” David L. Peterson, *Late Israelites Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles*, SBLMS (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1977), 25-26. See also, Diethelm Michel, “Zur Eigenart Tritojesajas,” *ThViat* 10 (1965/6), 213-230.

2.5.1. Apocalyptic Scribal Tradition

Kaiser gave more attention to the later hands who were having apocalyptic (following C. Westermann, 1966 → 1969)⁷³ and Deuteronomistic (following E. Sehmsdorf, 1972)⁷⁴ theological tendencies on the central block, but he did not provide more explanation on this. Concerning the apocalyptic tradition, Westermann claimed that, before the apocalyptic sources were embedded into chs. 56-66, all essential parts of Trito-Isaiah appeared as the final form before the rise of the apocalyptic period.⁷⁵ Vermeulen, Hanson, and Blenkinsopp expanded on Westermann further to suggest that the final editor of Trito-Isaiah was connected with apocalyptic or eschatological traditions. Jacques Vermeulen (1978) was also aligned with this interpretation. He observed that there are seven redactional stages found in chs. 56-66. Further, he claimed that the finalization of Trito-Isaiah was accomplished by apocalyptic or eschatological redactors in the third century B.C.E. while the oldest texts are dated before the Fall of Jerusalem in 587/6.⁷⁶ Hanson (1979) presupposed that the apocalyptic tradition blossomed within the post-exilic visionary circle as a reaction against the Priestly (esp. Zadokite) tradition.⁷⁷ This tendency is also found in Blenkinsopp's research (1988, 2004, 2019) on *haredim* (those who fear the word of YHWH) in 66:2, 5 in comparison with its usage in Ezra 9:3; 10:4.

⁷³ 60:19-20; 65:17a, 25; 66:15-16, 20, 22-24.

⁷⁴ 56:1-8; 58:13f; 60:18a; 62:8f; 65:1-16, 19b-25; 66:1-4.

⁷⁵ Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 306.

⁷⁶ Jacques Vermeulen, *Du Prophète Isaïe à L'Apocalyptique: Isaïe, I-XXXV, Miroir d'un Demi-Millénaire d'expérience Religieuse en Israël*, vol. 2. (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1978), 2-3, 471-89, 503-17.

⁷⁷ However, Duhm and Schramm considered that the messages within Trito-Isaiah would not be contradictory with the priestly tradition, instead it is conflicting with the syncretic religious practices. Sweeney (2005) argues that apocalyptic or visionary messages in the post-exilic texts are not so far from previous prophetic visionary traditions. See, *Form and Intertextuality*, 1-10.

Some Christian scholars were more interested in the eschatological theology than the apocalyptic scribal tradition within chs. 56-66. Kyung-Chul Park (2001), Emmanuel Uchenna Dim (2005) and Si Wai Hedy Hung (2014) also pointed out that chs. 65-66 function as the conclusion of the entire book within the eschatological framework.⁷⁸ Abraham Sung-Ho Oh's canonical research on chs. 56-66 (2018) showed the theology of Trito-Isaiah is rooted in prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology.⁷⁹ Soo J. Kim's recent article (2020) dealt with the eschatology of the entire book with spatial concerns of utopia and dystopia.⁸⁰

2.5.2. Deuteronomistic Scribal Tradition

Like the apocalyptic or eschatological tradition of Trito-Isaiah, the Deuteronomistic tradition has also been observed within the scholarship. E. Sehmsdorf (1972) argued that chs. 65-66 are influenced by the Deuteronomistic tradition of blessing the righteous and cursing the wicked.⁸¹ For example, 65:21-22 is influenced by Deut. 28.⁸² The phrase “the work of their hands” in 65:22 is related to Deut. 31:29. This idea is continued with Sweeney. His research on the redaction of chs. 1-4 (1988) argued that the redactor who held a Deuteronomistic ideology

⁷⁸ Kyung-Chul Park, *Die Gerechtigkeit Israels und das Heil der Völker: Kultus, Tempel, Eschatologie und Gerechtigkeit in der Endgestalt des Jesajabuches (Jes 56, 1-8; 58, 1-14; 65, 17-66, 24)* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2001), 336-358; Emmanuel Uchenna Dim, *The Eschatological Implications of Isa 65 and 66 as the Conclusion of the Book of Isaiah* (New York: Peter Lang, 2005); Si Wai Hedy Hung, *Eschatological Concepts in Trito-Isaiah* (PhD diss. University of Aberdeen, 2014).

⁷⁹ Abraham Sung-Ho Oh, *Oh, That You Would Rend the Heavens and Come Down!: The Eschatological Theology of Third Isaiah (Isaiah 56–66)* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2015).

⁸⁰ Soo J. Kim (a.k.a Soo J. Kim Sweeney), “Eschatology in Isaiah” in *The Oxford Handbook of Isaiah*, ed. Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 352-374.

⁸¹ E. Sehmsdorf, “Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte von Jesaja 56—66 (I). (Jes 65 16b-25; 66 1-4; 56 1-8)” *ZAW* 84.4 (1972) 517-562; (II), 562-576.

⁸² Sehmsdorf, 526-7. Isa 65:21a, 22aa with Deut. 28:30, Josh 24:1; Isa 65:23ab, bb with Deut 28:11, 18, 32, 41, 50, 53ff.

made a significant contribution by creating an enveloping structure of ch. 1 and chs. 65-66. The Deuteronomistic ideology was necessary to solve such problems of the righteous and the wicked in the Jewish community during the post-exilic period, especially Nehemiah and Ezra's time, by reconciling them with the earlier traditions: "The redaction reconciled this situation with an element of constitutive hermeneutic together with the prophetic element in line with Deuteronomistic ideology."⁸³ Jon L. Berquist (1995), as he discussed in the previous work on the social setting of Malachi (1989, c.f. Julia M. O'Brien, 1990), argued that Deuteronomistic ideology was found as the counter-voice against the Priestly tradition. Wolfgang Lau (1994) delineates five redactional blocks,⁸⁴ and he only includes a small discussion of the role of the final redactor or compiler.⁸⁵ Though he did not accept Deuteronomistic authorship on chs. 56-66 by later hands,⁸⁶ he admitted the Deuteronomic influences (Deut. 2:7; 14:29; 15:10; 16:15;

⁸³ *Isaiah 1-4 and the Post-exilic Understanding of the Isaianic Tradition*. BZAW 171 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1988), 196. His view on the Deuteronomistic ideology of Trito-Isaiah is close to the Josianic Dtr's pro-royal theology. The Deuteronomic criticism of the royal would be confined to those kings, whether or not of Northern Israel and Southern Judah, who were transgressing the covenantal relationship with YHWH. See Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah* (2001). Although it does not mention Deuteronomistic influences, these two articles on Davidic Covenant would be regarded. Concerning how the Davidic Covenant was reconceptualized in Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, Sweeney argues that the purpose of this is to make people of Israel serve as priesthood to nations in Zion within the context of Ezra and Nehemiah's restoration program. See also his "The Reconceptualization of the Davidic Covenant in Isaiah," in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah: Festschrift Willem A.M. Beuken*, ed. E. Peters, J. Van Ruiten, and M. Vervenne (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 41-61. R. E. Clements discussed how Davidic Covenant in Isaian traditions evolved within the historical circumstances of King Ahaz, Hezekiah, Josiah's reigns and the aftermath of the Fall of Jerusalem. See his "The Davidic Covenant in the Isaiah Tradition," in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E. W. Nicholson*, ed. A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salters (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 39-70.

⁸⁴ (1) Tritojesaja (chs. 60-62); (2) Tradentenkreis I (57:14-21; 66:7-14a; 65:16b-25); (3) Tradentenkreis II (66:18-24; 57:3-13; 66:1-4; 5f.15b-17; 65:1-7; 8-12. 13-16a); (4) Tradentenkreis III (59:1-21; 56:9-12+57:1-2; 58:1-14); (5) Einzelüberlieferungen (56:1-8, 63:1-6; 63:7-64:11).

⁸⁵ Wolfgang Lau, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie in Jes 56-66: Eine Untersuchung zu den literarischen Bezügen in den letzten elf Kapiteln des Jesajabuches*, BZAW 225 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), 20-21.

⁸⁶ Lau, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie*, 17.

24:19) on the phrase “the work of their hands” in 65:22.⁸⁷ Deuteronomistic impacts on 65:21-22 are discussed by Andrew T. Abernethy (2014) and Abraham Sung-Ho Oh (2015). Abernethy focused on one example of eating motifs in the entire book, while Oh is concerned with eschatology in Trito-Isaiah.⁸⁸

This attention to the theological or ideological characteristics of the later scribal traditions, whether or not they are apocalyptic, Deuteronomistic, or even priestly, is deeply related to reconstructing the socio-anthropological settings around Trito-Isaiah. It will be discussed in 2.9.

2.6. Structural and Rhetorical Attention on Trito-Isaiah since Mid-20th Century

2.6.1. Rhetorical

Meanwhile, some scholars began to give attention to the stylistic, rhetorical, and structural uniqueness of chs. 56-66. James Muilenburg’s work (1956) in the *Interpreter’s Bible* series⁸⁹ was the earlier attempt to approach the text. As we discussed in the previous section, though he was not throwing out the classical form-critical approach to the text, he refrained from analyzing specific *Sitz im Leben*. Nevertheless, he admitted that the addressor(s) of chs. 56-66 would be the disciple(s) of Deutero-Isaiah who were living in different conditions with his master, and their message resembles what of Haggai and Zechariah in terms of eschatological concerns. In this vein, he dates chs. 56-66 as a whole in the decade following 538 BCE, while he

⁸⁷ Lau, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie*, 138.

⁸⁸ Andrew T. Abernethy, *Eating in Isaiah: Approaching the Role of Food and Drink in Isaiah’s Structure and Message* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 155-160; Oh, *Oh, That You Would Rend the Heavens and Come Down!*, 205-7.

⁸⁹ James Muilenburg, “Isaiah 40-66,” *IB* 5 (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1956), 381-773.

disagreed with Duhm and Elliger's dating.⁹⁰ Most of his arguments, however, focused on the literary unity of Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah and identifying its writers as poets, not as prophets. Muilenburg describes how poetic and lyrical characteristics (parallelism, meter, assonance, dramatic style, imagery, catchwords, motifs, triads, strophes, etc.) are found in the text.⁹¹ His demarcation or outline of Trito-Isaiah is based on a poetic structure that is composed of lines and strophes.⁹²

Rhetorical approaches on the Isaian texts, with the consideration of the art of composition and persuasion both, are also found in Yehoshua Gitay (1978) on chs. 40-55,⁹³ Cheol Woo Park (1984) on chs. 40-48,⁹⁴ Gregory J. Polan (1986) on chs. 56-59,⁹⁵ and Curtis W. Fitzgerald (2003) on chs. 56-66.⁹⁶ Peter D. Quinn-Miscall (a.k.a. Peter D. Miscall) also dealt with the Book of Isaiah as a poem.⁹⁷ Mark Gray (2006) analyzed the rhetoric of social justice in the Isaian texts, in particular, chs. 1 and 58, by doing poststructural reading.

⁹⁰ Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," 384, 414.

⁹¹ Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," 386-393.

⁹² Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," 417-8.

⁹³ Gitay, *Rhetorical Analysis of Isaiah 40-48*.

⁹⁴ Cheol Woo Park, *The Triadic Pattern: A Study in the Structure of Isaiah 40-48* (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 1984). Also read his later article on the triadic pattern of chs. 56-66: Cheol Woo Park, "이 사야 56-66 장에 내재된 중앙집중구조와 삼단양식과, 그 특징에 관한 연구 [A Study on the Concentric Structure and the Triadic Pattern of Isaiah 56-66, and Its Particularities]" *KJOTS* 13.4 (2007). 70-91.

⁹⁵ Gregory J. Polan, *In the Ways of Justice toward Salvation: A Rhetorical Analysis of Isaiah 56-59* (New York: Peter Lang, 1986).

⁹⁶ Curtis W. Fitzgerald, *A Rhetorical Analysis of Isaiah 56-66* (PhD diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2003).

⁹⁷ Peter D. Miscall (a.k.a. Peter D. Quinn-Miscall), *Reading Isaiah: Poetry and Vision* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001). Peter D. Miscall, *Isaiah 34-35: A Nightmare/A Dream* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

2.6.2. Structural

Pierre-Émile Bonnard (1972) and Rémi Lack (1973), two French Catholic scholars influenced by structuralism and semiotics, focused on repetitions, catchwords, symmetry, and symbolism within the synchronic literary structure of Isaian texts.⁹⁸ These scholars, however, did not neglect diachronic analysis. Bonnard considered the author of chs. 56-66 as a single disciple of Deutero-Isaiah and having a certain unity of language.⁹⁹ He placed him in Jerusalem between the first arrival of returnees in 538 and the interventions of Haggai and Zechariah in 520.¹⁰⁰ In the case of 63:10-6 and 63:7-64:11, as some scholars regarded them as the earliest sources, he presupposed that these are not the prophet's work but carefully embedded by him. As Hanson did later, he also considered that 56:1-8 and 66:18-24 were both added by the later editors concerned to connect with Deutero-Isaiah (esp. 55:2).¹⁰¹ Lack also introduced redactional scholars (esp. Elliger, Westermann, and Pauritsch) and their views, but he was not committed to linking the text to specific time and space.¹⁰² He presupposed that 56:3-7 contained the original messages of the anonymous prophet himself to disagree with the exclusion of the priestly group. Interestingly, he viewed this prophet, who was following the previous Isaian tradition, as representing the voices of delegations of Babylonian returnees who were described as strangers, eunuchs, and even the poor. Furthermore, he identified the editor of the entirety of chs. 56-66

⁹⁸ Bonnard, *Le Second Isaïe*, 8; Rémi Lack, *La symbolique du livre d'Isaïe: Essai sur l'image littéraire comme élément de structuration* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1973), 13-27.

⁹⁹ Bonnard, *Le Second Isaïe*, 317.

¹⁰⁰ Bonnard, *Le Second Isaïe*, 320.

¹⁰¹ Bonnard, *Le Second Isaïe*, 319.

¹⁰² Lack, *La symbolique*, 122-3.

with the prophet. Then he brought his thinking back to the theory of the single author, which was rejuvenated by D. R. Jones, to focus on the literary unity itself and its artistry.¹⁰³

Nevertheless two French scholars admitted that chs. 56-66 was composed not only by a single author but also later redactional editors. The symmetrical demarcation below, which Bonnard suggested, was based on his synchronic understanding of the final form.

Table 4. Bonnard's Chiastic Demarcation¹⁰⁴

LV1		ch.61	Mission of the prophet and his echo
LV2		ch.60	ch.62 Jerusalem; the glory of the city described
LV3		59:15b-20	Future, God of Just, revenge, redemption, bringing salvation 63:1-6
LV4	59:1-15a; 58	Reproaches/Implorations, confession of sins,	63:7-64:11
LV5	56:9-57:21	Reproaches, promise to the faithful	65:1-66:17
LV6	56:1-8	Observance of the Sabbath, the foreigners coming to the Holy Mountain.	66:18-24

The chiastic structure (A-B-B'-A') is also found in Lack, but he demarcated chs. 56-66 into four levels: 1) chs. 60-62, 2) 59:15-21; 63:1-6, 3) 59:1-14; 63:7-64:11, 4) chs. 56-58, chs. 65-66.¹⁰⁵ This is also perceived by Blenkinsopp (2003)¹⁰⁶ and Goldingay (2014a, b),¹⁰⁷ while

¹⁰³ Lack, *La symbolique*, 124-125. His argument on the composition of the Book of Isaiah, see, 142-145; Jones, *Isaiah 56-66 and Joel*, 27-28.

¹⁰⁴ Bonnard, *Le Second Isaïe*, 318; Lack, *La symbolique*, 125.

¹⁰⁵ Lack, *La symbolique*, 125.

¹⁰⁶ Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 19 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 60-63.

¹⁰⁷ John Goldingay, *Isaiah 56-66: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 3 (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014a), 2; *The Theology of the Book of Isaiah* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2014b), 14.

they preferred to call it ‘pyramid.’ Their programs were very similar to what Bonnard suggested, except for some modifications.

Lack developed how this scheme evolved with patterned thematic vocabularies related to the highway and exodus motif; highway and walking, thinking and wanting, salvation and justice, God, glory, and joy. In chs. 56-58 and 65-66, the theme of *l'exode sur place* is found. The highway here does not mean a specific and geographical one from Babylon to Jerusalem that the Second Isaiah describes, but expands its concepts into a more abstract and spiritual level between the righteous and the wicked. As a result, its departure and arrival are the same.¹⁰⁸ Bonnard, however, did not give much explanation on his scheme. He preferred to think of his scheme as hypothetical, rather than absolute, and focused on providing evidence for the thematic unity of chs. 56-66.

Nous ne pensons pas qu'il y ait en réalité dans cet arrangement un plan véritablement concerté...Comme elle ne disparaît pas tout à fait, nous avons relevé cette récurrence de thèmes analogues à intervalles réguliers comme une preuve supplémentaires tendant à montrer que notre livret prophétique se révèle plus unifié qu'il n'y paraissait au premier abord. Même si ce «plan» n'est pas contraignant, il invite, on le voit, à considérer que les pièces du recueil ne sont pas étrangères les unes aux autres, et il suggère que pour la plupart elles peuvent provenir du même Prophète.¹⁰⁹

As Sweeney evaluates structure analysis, it “is not intended to argue for a process of composition but to show how these chapters, in their present form, develop the themes that are

¹⁰⁸ Bonnard, *Le Second Isaïe*, 318; Lack, *La symbolique*, 129-131, 134-136.

¹⁰⁹ Bonnard, *Le Second Isaïe*, 319.

contained within them and how the individual units work together to present a coherent message.”¹¹⁰

2.7. Rising Attention on Synchronic Unity of the Final Form

Scholars in the mid- and late-twentieth century began to re-evaluate the final form and its synchronic structure of the Book of Isaiah. In particular, they examined its synchronic structure in light of the theories of literary history or formation of the Book we’ve discussed above. This movement toward intratextual unity from the authorial disunity was discussed in John Eaton’s article in 1959. Rather than try to reconstruct a particular hypothetical *Sitz im Leben*, he focused more on the thematic development within the final-form. This direction followed Mowinckel, who praised the later Isaian discipleship as "brilliant reapplication of tradition to a new situation.”¹¹¹ In this vein, the location and its function of chs. 56-66 are evaluated within the final-form structure of the entire book. It will be discussed in three parts: 1) focusing inclusion of chs. 65-66 and ch. 1 within the final-form structure; 2) evaluating gaps between ch. 33 and ch. 34 in the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a); and 3) debates around the one-author theory within Evangelical circle.

2.7.1. Inclusion of Chs. 65-66 and Ch. 1

First, the final scribal hand who tied into chs. 65-66 and ch. 1 as the closing bookend of the entire book is revisited. Leon J. Liebreich (1956) discussed how the last two chapters (chs.

¹¹⁰ Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-4*, 89 (footnote 207).

¹¹¹ John H. Eaton, “The Origin of the Book of Isaiah,” *VT* 9 (1959), 152.

65-66) have close lexical affinities with the first chapter of the Book of Isaiah. Although he did not determine the scope of texts that belong to authors ranging from the first to the final redactor, he posited that the redactor responsible for this bookend had “the unmistakable intention and fixed determination to make the Book end in the same vein with which it begins.”¹¹² Rémi Lack (1973), following Liebreich, also focused on the symmetrical structure. He analyzed the lexical similarities and shared eschatological themes between chs. 65-66 and 1.¹¹³ J. Vermeylen (1978) went further to discuss how the first edition of chs. 56-66 was redacted based upon 1:2-2:5.¹¹⁴ Peter R. Ackroyd (1978) also mentioned that the final compiler of the book was “sensitive to import [the importance] of this opening section and to have echoed it in their conclusion.”¹¹⁵ W. A. M. Beuken (1991) also noticed shared vocabularies between chs. 65-66 and ch. 1.¹¹⁶ Sweeney (1988, 2010), however, had dealt with this intertextual relationship regarding a redactional viewpoint. He argued that:

Not only do their studies indicate that chapters 40-66 build upon themes, concepts, and language from chapters 1-39, but that the first part of the book is presented in such a way as to anticipate the concerns of the second. In other words, the two parts of the book cannot be properly understood in isolation from each other, they must be understood as two interrelated components of a redactional unified whole.¹¹⁷

¹¹² Leon J. Liebreich, “The Compilation of the Book of Isaiah,” *JQR* 46.4 (1956), 260, 276-7; “The Compilation of the Book of Isaiah (Continued),” *JQR* 47.2 (1956), 126-7.

¹¹³ Lack, *La symbolique*, 139-42.

¹¹⁴ Vermeylen, *Du Prophète Isaïe à L'Apocalyptique*, 504-11.

¹¹⁵ P. R. Ackroyd “Isaiah I-XII: Presentation of a Prophet,” in *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977*. VTSup 29. ed. John Emerton (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 43.

¹¹⁶ He suggests that the threefold epilogues would be found in ch. 65-66 in relation to the final form of the entire book; the conclusion of Trito-Isaiah itself (65:1-66:14), one of DI and TI together (66:15-21), and one of the whole book (66:22-24). See W. A. M. Beuken, “Isaiah Chapters LXV-LXVI: Trito-Isaiah and the Closure of the Book of Isaiah,” in *Congress Volume Leuven 1989*, VTSup 43. ed. J. A. Emerton (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 217-220.

¹¹⁷ Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-4*, 5.

This idea is presented in his first published book in 1988 while admitting that the original text of chs. 1-4 came from the eighth-century prophet himself.¹¹⁸ He focused on how the final form of chs. 1-4 was redacted by the post-exilic final redactor. In his 2010 article, he argued that the redactors of chs. 65-66 were citing and interpreting ch. 1 and materials from the entire book.¹¹⁹

Odil Hannes Steck (1987, 1991), Edgar W. Conrad (1991), and Anthony J. Tomasino (1993) were interested in the larger literary unit of 63:7-66:24 with ch. 1. The first two scholars were well discussed in Carr's article in 1996.¹²⁰ Tomasino focused on structural parallelism between 1:1-2:4 and 63:7-66:24 except ch. 65.¹²¹ Ch. 65 and some parts of ch. 66 were considered the later addition inserted by the second redactor who perceived ch. 1 as a self-contained unit after the insertion of the secondary introduction 2:1.¹²² David Carr (1993), while he admitted that both 1:2-31 and chs. 65-66 have a macrostructural role in the entire book, points out that each rhetorical purpose is different from the other: 1:2-31 aims to exhort its audience to repent, but the righteous and the wicked are already determined in the past tense statements of chs. 65-66. Therefore, there is no room for exhortation for repentance as it appears in chs. 65-

¹¹⁸ Georg Fohrer, "The Origin, Composition and Tradition of Isaiah I-XXXIX" in *Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society* 3 (1961), 3-38; Fohrer, *Jesaja als Zusammenfassung der Verkündigung Jesajas*, ZAW 74 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962), 251-68.

¹¹⁹ Sweeney, "Prophetic Exegesis in Isaiah 65-66" in *Form and Intertextuality*, 46-62.

¹²⁰ David M. Carr, "Reading Isaiah from Beginning (Isaiah 1) to End (Isaiah 65-66): Multiple Modern Possibilities," in *New Visions of Isaiah*, ed. Roy F. Melugin and Marvin A. Sweeney, JSOTSup 214 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 190-93.

¹²¹ Anthony J. Tomasino, "Isaiah 1.1-2.4 and 63-66, and the Composition of the Isaianic Corpus," *JSOT* 57 (1993), 93, 95. He presupposed that the author of chs. 63-66 knew about the ch. 1 (which was composed before the Deutero-Isaiah) and Deutero-Isaiah.

¹²² Tomasino, "Isaiah 1.1-2.4 and 63-66," 96-97.

66.¹²³ Some scholars reviewed this deterministic and ontological interpretation of chs. 65-66 with the theory of rhetorical discontinuity of symmetrical structure. In his later article in 1996,¹²⁴ he developed his previous proposal with his observation of 63:7-64:11 with W. Beyerlin's theory of 63:7-64:11 as a supplication rather than a lament¹²⁵ and Steck's diachronic (1987, 1991)¹²⁶ and Conrad's synchronic analysis (1991)¹²⁷ of chs. 65-66 as the divine answer of the supplication in 63:7-64:11.

Roy F. Melugin (1996) points out that Carr was overstating "the inevitability of consequences" for the righteous and the wicked in chs. 65-66. According to Melugin, the messages of restoration and judgment in chs. 40-66 are not considered deterministic but decisions are still up to the free will of the implied audience in the futuristic nuance. In this respect, he dealt with how the imagery of judgment and restoration in ch. 1 reappeared in chs. 65-66.¹²⁸ Sweeney (2010), standing with Melugin, suggested an indeterministic and teleological view. He regarded the messages of restoration and judgment in chs. 65-66 as still in the choice list depending on whether the audience decides to be *haredim* of the word of YHWH (66:2).¹²⁹

¹²³ David M. Carr, "Reaching for Unity in Isaiah," *JSOT* 57 (1993) 61-80 (esp. 73-75).

¹²⁴ Carr, "Reading Isaiah from Beginning (Isaiah 1) to End (Isaiah 65-66)," 188-218.

¹²⁵ Walter Beyerlin, *Die Rettung der Bedrängten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen auf institutionelle Zusammenhänge untersucht*, FRLANT 99 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 152-55.

¹²⁶ Odil Hannes Steck, "Beobachtungen zur Anlage von Jes 65-66" *Biblische Notizen* 38/39 (1987) 103-116. Same article in *Studien zu Tritojesaja* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991), 217-28.

¹²⁷ Edgar W. Conrad, *Reading Isaiah* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991), 91-116.

¹²⁸ Roy F. Melugin, "'Figurative Speech and the Reading of Isaiah 1 as Scripture" in *New Visions of Isaiah*, 300-1.

¹²⁹ Sweeney, *Form and Intertextuality*, 46-47.

2.7.2. Gap between Ch. 33 and Ch. 34

Before discovering the gaps in the Dead Sea Scroll, scholars focused on the diachronic dimension of chs. 34-35 concerning the later traditions. Gesenius (1821) ascribed chs. 34-35 to the author of chs. 13-14.¹³⁰ Heinrich Ewald (1840-41, 1843-59) ascribed chs. 34-35 to the author of Jer 50-51.¹³¹ Since Graetz (1891), chs. 34-35 have been understood to be a later interpolation by an author who was responsible for the formation of Deutero-Isaiah, whether its range covered chs. 40-55 or 40-66. Graetz had proposed that ch. 35 was originally placed between 51:3 and 51:4,¹³² while presupposing ch. 34 as the imitation of some parts of Jeremiah.¹³³ Torrey (1928), as we discussed above, considered chs. 34-35 as the introductory part of chs. 40-66, while Elliger (1933) ascribed them to Trito-Isaiah.¹³⁴ A. T. Olmstead (1915, 1937) also dealt with ch. 35 as the aligned part of chs. 40-55.¹³⁵ R. B. Y. Scott (1936) researched the stylistic similarities between ch. 35 and chs. 40-55, but he still was indecisive as to its authorship.¹³⁶ Marvin Pope (1952) also did research similar to Scott's by reviewing his article, but he focused on ch. 34 and concluded

¹³⁰ Gesenius, *Der Prophet Jesaia*, vol. 2, 908.

¹³¹ Heinrich Ewald, *Die Propheten des alten Bundes*, vol. 1-2 (1840-1841); *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (1843-1859).

¹³² Hans Wildberger wrongly cites it as Jer 51:3-4, not Isa. See Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 28-39, Continental Commentary*. trans. Thomas H. Trapp (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002; originally published in German, 1982), 346.

¹³³ H. Graetz, "Isaiah XXXIV. and XXXV" *JQR* 4.1. (1891), 1-8.

¹³⁴ Torrey, *The Second Isaiah*, 53; Karl Elliger, *Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer 1933); *Deuterojesaja* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978); Claire R. Mathews notes Elliger's view on chs. 34-35, "Based on these observations the most probable conclusion for Elliger is that chs. 34-35 were composed from the start as a conclusion or appendix to 1-33 prior to the attachment of 36-39, and he argues for a dating in the time of Third Isaiah, which he places in the last half of the 6th Century B.C.E.". See Claire R. Mathews (a.k.a. Claire Mathews McGinnis), *Defending Zion Edom's Desolation and Jacob's Restoration (Isaiah 34-35) in Context*. BZAW 236 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995), 24-25.

¹³⁵ A. T. Olmstead, "The Earliest Book of Kings" *AJSL* 31 (1915) 196; "II Isaiah and Isaiah, Chapter 35" *AJSL* 53 (1937) 251-53.

¹³⁶ R. B. Y. Scott, "The Relation of Isaiah, Chapter 35, to Deutero-Isaiah" *AJSL* 52 (1936), 178-91.

that the literary interdependence is found between ch. 34 and chs. 40-66.¹³⁷ John L. McKenzie (1964)¹³⁸ and J. D. Smart (1964)¹³⁹ also considered chs. 34-35 (for Smart, ch. 35) as the part of Deutero-Isaiah (chs. 40-66) without any concern of Trito-Isaiah. Odil Hannes Steck (1985) argued that ch. 35 functions as the transitional bridge.¹⁴⁰ John H. Hayes and Stuart A. Irvine (1987)'s, who co-authored commentary on Proto-Isaiah, also did not count chs. 34-35 as the work by the eighth-century prophet: "Isaiah 34-35 has many affinities with the remainder of the book (Isaiah 40-66) and probably derives from a period later than the eighth century."¹⁴¹ W. A. M. Beuken (1991) calls chs. 33 the mirror text (*Spiegeltext*) since it reflects vocabularies and themes from other texts found throughout the entire book.¹⁴²

Meanwhile, W. H. Brownlee (1952) read chs. 34-35 within the final-form structure of the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a, Brownlee called it DSI^a in the 1952 article), which was found in the first cave of Qumran in 1947.¹⁴³ He paid attention to the blank space in the three lines at the bottom of column 27, which ends ch. 33, without any insertions. This gap was first perceived by Paul Kahle one year before (1951). Kahle presupposed the Qumran scroll had been copied from two different manuscripts, and then he argued that this is the evidence needed to prove Torrey's Deutero-Isaiah (Chs. 34-35, 40-66) without any explanation why chs. 36-39 are included in this

¹³⁷ Marvin Pope, "Isaiah 34 in Relation to Isaiah 35, 40-66", *JBL* 71 (1951), 235-43.

¹³⁸ John L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 20 (New York: Doubleday, 1967), 3-12.

¹³⁹ Smart, *History and Theology in Second Isaiah*.

¹⁴⁰ Odil Hannes Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr: Jesaja 35 als redaktionelle Brücke zwischen dem Ersten und dem Zweiten Jesaja* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 1985).

¹⁴¹ John H. Hayes and Stuart A. Irvine, *Isaiah, the Eighth Century Prophet: His Times & His Preaching* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1987), 13.

¹⁴² W. A. M. Beuken, "Jesaja 33 als Spiegeltext im Jesajabuch" *ETL* 67.1 (1991), 5-35.

¹⁴³ William H. Brownlee, "The Manuscripts of Isaiah from Which DSI^a Was Copied," *BASOR* 127 (1952), 16-21.

second scroll.¹⁴⁴ In this respect, Brownlee argued this is evidence that the entire book was composed as two volumes. He hypothesized that what the Qumran scribe had was the whole scroll of chs. 1-33 in good condition which functioned as the *Vorlage* of the first half of the 1QIsa^a. This first volume would appear before the addition of chs. 34-35 and 40-66. In the case of the second edition of chs. 34-66, though it appeared in the mutilated condition, the scribe had no way to evade using it as the *Vorlage* of the second half of the 1QIsa^a. Then it was necessary to insert missing texts into vacant spaces.¹⁴⁵ Brownlee went further in his later article (1964).¹⁴⁶ By following Torrey's dual divisions rather than Duhm's tripartite divisions, he suggested that the present form of the entire scroll, which is composed of two volumes (he was hesitating to identify each volume as book/s or author/s), was finalized by those who were standing in the Isaianic tradition.¹⁴⁷ Then, he suggested that the literary structure of the two volumes is paralleled in terms of seven main themes as follows.

¹⁴⁴ Paul Kahle, *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1951), 72ff.

¹⁴⁵ Brownlee, "The Manuscripts," 20-21.

¹⁴⁶ William H. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible: With Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), 247-260.

¹⁴⁷ Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls*, 253-5.

Table 5. Brownlee's Bisectional Structure of Two Volumes of Isaiah¹⁴⁸

	Vol. 1 (chs. 1-33)	Vol. 2 (chs. 34-66)
1	The Ruin and Restoration of Judah (chs. 1-5)	Paradise Lost and Regained (chs. 34-35)
2	Biography (chs. 6-8)	Biography (chs. 36-40)
3	Agents of Divine Blessing and Judgement (chs. 9-12)	Agents of Deliverance and Judgment (chs. 41-45)
4	Anti-foreign Oracles (chs. 13-23)	Anti-Babylonian Oracles (chs. 46-48)
5	Universal Judgment and the Deliverance of God's People (chs. 24-27)	Universal Redemption through the Lord's Servant, also the Glorification of Israel (chs. 49-54)
6	Ethical Sermons, Indicting Israel and Judah (chs. 28-31)	Ethical Sermons, the Ethical Conditions for Israel's Redemption (chs. 56-59)
7	The Restoration of Judah and the Davidic Kingdom (chs. 32-33)	Paradise Regained: The Glories of the New Jerusalem and the New Heaven and the New Earth (chs. 60-66)

In the case of chs. 36-39, Brownlee was calling attention to its biographical traits, which were also found in chs. 7-8. For literary balance, pre-exilic material of chs. 36-39 was inserted into the second volume.¹⁴⁹ Its reverse also happened (i.e., chs. 24-27 into the first volume).¹⁵⁰ Scholars—including Craig A. Evans (1988), Avraham Gileadi (1994), and Sweeney (1998),

¹⁴⁸ Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls*, 247-9.

¹⁴⁹ Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls*, 249, 254. More discussions on chs. 36-39, see Christopher R. Seitz, *Zion's Final Destiny: The Development of the Book of Isaiah: A Reassessment of Isaiah 36-39* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991); Peter R. Acroyd "Isaiah 36-39: Structure and Function" in his *Studies in the Religious Tradition of the Old Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1995), 105-120; Song-Mi Suzie Park, *Hezekiah and the Dialogue of Memory* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015); Jeaman (Jaeman) Choi, *Three Portrayals of King Hezekiah: A Comparison of 2 Kings 18-20, Isaiah 36-39, and 2 Chronicles 2* (PhD diss., McMaster Divinity College, 2015); Sehoon Jang, "Is Hezekiah a Success or a Failure?: The Literary Function of Isaiah's Prediction at the End of the Royal Narratives in the Book of Isaiah" *JSOT* 42.1 (2017), 117-35.

¹⁵⁰ Brownlee presupposed that chs. 24-27 as the work in the second century B.C.E. However, recent studies on chs. 24-27 suggest more earlier dating of it in relation to King Josiah's reign in the seventh century B.C.E. See recent study from Christopher B. Hays, *The Origins of Isaiah 24-27: Josiah's Festival Scroll for the Fall of Assyria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019).

Raymond Dillard and Tremper Longman (2009), and Seul-gi L. Byun (2015)—accepted Brownlee's suggestion made from the synchronic standpoint.¹⁵¹

Edward J. Young (1965), however, criticized Brownlee's bisectional structure because it seemed "to be forced and not derived from an exegesis of the text itself," then argued that this division was "made simply for the sake of convenience."¹⁵² However, he did not provide any more discussions on this. He posited that the messages in chs. 34-35 and chs. 40-66 should be regarded as work before the fourth year of Jehoiakim (the first year of Nebuchadnezzar II). In this respect, he reversed Graetz's theory. Unlike Young, John D. W. Watts accepted the basic premise of diachronic formation through three centuries and assumed that the final form of the entire book appeared in 435 by one who self-identified as the persecuted minority in 66:5-6.¹⁵³ However, he did not provide any specific explanation why this date (two years before the Nehemiah's returning to Artaxerxes I) should be essential and why this author and his group were persecuted, or by whom. Even though his commentary (1985, 87) was divided into chs. 1-33 and chs. 34-66 without any mention of Brownlee's bisectional structure, he did not tell much about why. He divided the entire book into twelve acts/generations within two parts of literary

¹⁵¹ Craig A. Evans, "On the Unity and Parallel Structure of Isaiah" *VT* 38 (1988), 129-147; Avraham Gileadi, *The Literary Message of Isaiah* (New York: Hebraeus Press, 1994); Marvin A. Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39: With an Introduction to Prophetic Literature*, FOTL 16 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998); Raymond Dillard and Tremper Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, second edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006; first published in 1994), 301-320; Seul-gi L. Byun, "The Biblical Texts of Isaiah at Qumran," in *Bind Up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah*, ed. Daniel Isaac Block and Richard L. Schultz (Peabody, MA, MA: Hendrickson, 2015), 65-80.

¹⁵² Edward J. Young, "Isaiah 34 and Its Position in the Prophecy," *WTJ* 27 (1965), 94, 96.

¹⁵³ John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, WBC 24 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), xxvi, xxx-xxxi.

drama (the last six acts of Part II are identical with chs. 40-66).¹⁵⁴ The discussions around the authorship/s within Evangelical scholarship will be discussed in the following subsection.

Ronald E. Clements (1982) focused more on the transitional function of chs. 36-39 (esp. ch. 39) while considering chs. 1-35 as 'Assyrian Part' and chs. 40-66 as 'Babylonian Part.' In this respect, he was assuming that the last redactional stage of chs. 36-39 would be related to the late sixth and early fifth century after the formation of chs. 40-55. However, he did not say this redactor would be identical with Deutero-Isaiah or Trito-Isaiah.¹⁵⁵ This idea was continued in his 1985 article. By introducing the case of ch. 35 how the later thematic development of blindness and deafness were consciously functioning as the editorial and interpretive roles, he emphasized how ch. 39 has the same role in bridging the gap between the former and the latter.¹⁵⁶ His 2002 article went further, suggesting that chs. 5-35, which contain the apocalyptic texts like chs. 24-27 and 34-35, is a self-contained whole, which he called the 'Fourth Isaiah.' He dated it in the second half of the fourth century B.C.E.¹⁵⁷ Christopher R. Seitz (1993), however, highlighted the current placement of chs. 34-35 as the bridge (as suggested by Steck) which was followed by chs. 36-39. Following Torrey's view, Seitz felt that chs. 34-35 share the same theme of the

¹⁵⁴ Watts, *Isaiah 1-33* (1985), xlvii-li. His treatment of Persian rules, Deutero-Isaiah, and Trito-Isaiah is very limited in his second volume. Watts, *Isaiah 34-66*, WBC 25 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987) xxiv-xxv, 69-73, 367-8.

¹⁵⁵ Ronald E. Clements, "Unity of the Book of Isaiah," *Int* 36 (1982), 120, 123.

¹⁵⁶ Ronald E. Clements, "Beyond Tradition-history: Deutero-Isaianic Development of First Isaiah's Themes?" *JSOT* 31 (1985), 95-113 (esp. 98, 103). See also, Ackroyd, "Isaiah I-XII. Presentation of a Prophet?", 16-48.

¹⁵⁷ Ronald E. Clements, "Isaiah: A Book without an Ending?" *JSOT* 97 (2002) 109-126. However, this suggestion has not been strongly supported by the current scholarship; Hans Wildberger also followed Steck's theory of post-exilic date of ch. 35. Hans Wildberger, "The Theory of a Josianic Edition of the First Part of the Book of Isaiah: A Critical Examination," in *Studies in Isaiah: History, Theology and Reception*, ed. Tommy Wasserman, Greger Andersson, and David Willgren, LHBOTS 654 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), 8. See also Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 28-39*, 346-47.

restoration of Zion with chs. 40-55 and function as the bridge. He, however, did not admit the theory of Trito-Isaiah.¹⁵⁸

2.7.3. Back to the One-Author Theory?: The Debates around Evangelical Circle

In the meantime, some scholars within the Evangelical circle were trying to return to the one-author theory with its consideration of not only literary synchrony but also of a theological definition of the prophecy. Oswald T. Allis (1950) is one of the well-known defenders of this theory. He was one of the scholars who remained at Princeton from the time of the Fundamentalist–Modernist controversy—a dispute amongst Northern Presbyterians in the 1920s and 1930s. He rejected all kinds of diachronic divisions, whether it was Duhm’s tripartite or Torrey’s dual divisions of the entire book. Instead, he was trying to hold the predictive, not the postdictive (*Vaticinium ex eventu*), nature of prophecy. In this respect, he situated chs. 40-66, including Cyrus texts in chs. 40-48, within the context of what ch. 39 provides (the visitation of the Babylonian embassy to King Hezekiah).¹⁵⁹ Edward J. Young (1954, 1965-1972), a colleague of Allis at Westminster, and Gleason L. Archer, Jr. (1964 → revised. 1974), was also standing with this line as we discussed above.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁸ Christopher R. Seitz, “On the Question of Divisions Internal to the Book of Isaiah” in SBLSP. ed. Eugene H. Lovering (1993), 262-5. His discussions on the theme of Zion. His consideration of chs. 36-39 is with the 2Kgs 18-20, see Seitz, *Zion's Final Destiny* (1991).

¹⁵⁹ Oswald T. Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah: A Study in Prophecy* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2000; first published in 1950), 45-48.

¹⁶⁰ Edward J. Young, *Studies in Isaiah* (London: Tyndale Press, 1954); *The Book of Isaiah*, vol. 1-3, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1965-1972); Gleason L. Archer, Jr. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, revised edition (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974; first published in 1964), 326-51.

During the 1980s and 1990s, Herbert M. Wolf (1985),¹⁶¹ John N. Oswalt (1986),¹⁶² and J. Alec Motyer (1993)¹⁶³ were standing with the one authorship theory. While they admitted the stylistic and thematic differences between chs. 1-39 and chs. 40-66, in view of the prescriptive nature of prophecy, they assumed that all texts came from Isaiah ben Amoz in the eighth century because of the correspondence between the first and later parts. They presupposed that Isaiah was speaking out his messages within different circumstances which would explain the stylistic and thematic differences. In other words, Wolf admitted the diachronic aspects of one's language: "differences between the subject matter and the theological ideas of chapters 1-39 and chapters 40-66 can partially be accounted for by the changed circumstances toward the end of Isaiah's ministry and by assuming that there was a lapse of time between the writing of those two sections."¹⁶⁴ This is also found in Oswalt. As a critical response to Yehuda T Raddy's conclusion of at least one other author for chs. 40-66 as a result of his computerized, statistical linguistic analysis on the entire book (1970, 1973),¹⁶⁵ he dealt with differences as 'variations' of one's speech habit or writing style, not as the result of later compositional processes.

Do we yet know enough to speak with confidence about the possible limits of variations in a given person's usage? More seriously, is the analysis of the language in predetermined sections of the book (the language of chs. 1-12 as opposed to the language of chs. 40-48) able to do justice to variations in similar segments, such as paragraphs and sentences? Does not the "averaging" involved

¹⁶¹ Herbert M. Wolf, *Interpreting Isaiah: The Suffering and Glory of the Messiah* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1985), 27-38.

¹⁶² John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah. Chapter 1-39*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986).

¹⁶³ J. Alec Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1993).

¹⁶⁴ Wolf, *Interpreting Isaiah*, 33.

¹⁶⁵ Yehuda T. Raddy, "Two Computerized Statistical-Linguistic Tests concerning the Unity of Isaiah" *JBL* 89.3. (1970), 319-24. See also his *The Unity of Isaiah in the Light of Statistical Linguistics* (Hildesheim; Gerstenberg, 1973).

in treating the book in sections tend to level off some variations which might otherwise appear?¹⁶⁶

In this respect, first, it should be concluded that even these one-author theorists noticed how the languages delivered within the entire book had changed and evolved in the course of history, which belonged to the eighth-century prophet himself in Jerusalem. As Oswalt said, “It is a matter of observation that different subject matters, as well as different periods in a person’s life, produce different styles.”¹⁶⁷ However, this attempt is also hypothetical and subjective because we did not have much cross-textual and archeological evidence on the entire picture of historical Isaiah, nor a historicized one, as is the case of later anonymous editors. Another example of this hypothetical nature is Motyer’s thematic divisions of the entire book, which are based on the three different messianic portrayals with his consideration of historical Isaiah. Motyer linked chs. 1-37 (the book of the King) with the death of King Uriah (740/39) to Sennacherib’s invasion (701), chs. 38-55 (the book of the Servant) and chs. 56-66 (the book of the Anointed Conqueror) during and after the visitation of Babylonian envoys around 700 BCE.¹⁶⁸ Second, Wolf, Oswalt, and Motyer were not adherents of mechanical inspiration and verbal dictation. Instead, they were admitting the interpretive role of a human author with divine revelation. Oswalt noted,

Without automatically assuming that one writer sat down and started writing at 1:1 and worked straight through to 66:24, one may still logically expect that there were reasons for putting one set of ideas in conjunction with another that were more significant than mere word association (to which some scholars resort to explain why one statement followed another). In fact, whoever assembled the book and however it was assembled, there is an observable structure about its thought that explains the power of the book and

¹⁶⁶ Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah. Chapter 1-39*, 18-19.

¹⁶⁷ Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah. Chapter 1-39*, 26.

¹⁶⁸ Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 13-16, 19-23.

without which the book becomes little more than a collection of sayings put together for no apparent reason.¹⁶⁹

To argue the coherency of the book by one author, Wolf, Oswalt, and Motyer were dealing with how the stylistic and thematic structure functioned in the present finalized literature. If the *Sitz im Leben* of one-authorship is dismissed, this is identical with what synchronic critics did.

Recent scholars in the 2000s and 2010s dealt with issues around authorship with canonical consideration. Gary V. Smith (2009) was taking a central position with his consideration of Child's canonical approach rather than the redactional: "No one should simply ignore the wisdom of the traditional interpretation of our forefathers when reading chaps. 40-55, but one should never allow the traditional interpretation of a verse to prevent the possibility of understanding a verse in a new way if the preponderance of evidence points in a new direction."¹⁷⁰ Without any decisive diachronic considerations of authorship/s, he tried to find the thematic unity of chs. 40-66. His later article in 2015 was focused more on the diachronic issues in chs. 40-55. In it, he assumed that the description of the king in chs. 40-55 would be equivalent to that of Sennacherib, while the Cyrus text is confined in 44:24-45:7 with futuristic exaltation.¹⁷¹

Richard L. Schultz was a strong proponent of the one authorship theory that had been proposed by earlier Evangelical scholars mentioned above. In his article at the 2001 Wheaton

¹⁶⁹ Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah. Chapter 1-39*, 21.

¹⁷⁰ Gary V. Smith, *Isaiah 40-66*, NAC 15B (Nashville, TN, B&H Publishing, 2009), 41.

¹⁷¹ Gary V. Smith, "Cyrus of Sennacherib? Historical Issues Involved in the Interpretation of Isaiah 40-55" in *Bind Up the Testimony*, 175-194.

Theology Conference (published in 2004), he summarized how contemporary Evangelical scholars had dealt with the prophetic inspiration of the Book of Isaiah in various ways, from traditional/orthodoxy to progressive. However, his understanding of “Evangelical” biblical hermeneutics is identical with what he called “traditional interpretation.” He was very critical of those Evangelicals who accepted the theories of diachronic divisions¹⁷² because they were 1) admitting the multiple authorship with the deductive hypothesis of Isaianic school or tradition even though considering the thematic and canonical unity of the entire book; 2) locating prophetic inspiration within the context of the (hypothetical) later editorial agents, not just of the eighth-century prophet himself; 3) describing a prophet as one who was influenced by his contemporary circumstances, not one who was inspired by God only; 4) not paying much attention to what the superscriptions in 1:1 and 2:1 describe as the prophet's half-century ministry and his futuristic messages.¹⁷³ However, he did not present enough discussion about why the prescriptive and futuristic nature is the only absolute way to define biblical prophecy and how each text within the book is situated within the half-century ministry of the historical Isaiah. In his 2012 article, he stated that he wants to “conserve” ancient connections between the author and the book.¹⁷⁴ Willem A. VanGemenen followed this idea in his 2016 article.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷² Such as LaSor, Hubbard, and Bush (1982 → revised 1996), Watts (1985), Meade (1987), Schneider (1988, 1990), Dillard and Longman (1994 → revised 2006), Goldingay (1994) and Conrad (1997). Also, Erickson (1983 → 1995).

¹⁷³ Richard L. Schultz, “How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter?: Prophetic Inspiration in Recent Evangelical Scholarship,” in *Evangelicals and Scripture: Tradition, Authority and Hermeneutics*, ed. Vincent Bacote, Laura C. Miguélez, and Dennis L. Okholm (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2004), 150-70.

¹⁷⁴ Richard L. Schultz, “Isaiah, Isaiahs and Current Scholarship,” in *Do Historical Matters Matter to Faith?: A Critical Appraisal of Modern and Postmodern Approaches to Scripture*, ed. James K. Hoffmeier and Dennis R. Magary (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012), 243-61.

In his 2015 article, Schultz continued to invest lots of pages to criticize the theory of multi-authorship, then simply proposed three points of departure for future Evangelical scholars without any further detailed discussion that explained why.

The essay concludes with discussions of (1) the difficulty of dating, deliming, and determining the meaning of individual texts in the book of Isaiah, and (2) the warrant of positing Spirit-directed editorial work in the formation of the text, as well as (3) a proposal that Isaiah might be considered the primary source of the prophecies in the book rather than their sole author/editor. These topics are provided as points of departure for the following essays in this collection.¹⁷⁶

Although he did not agree with the compositional history and the postscriptive characteristic of the prophecy, unlike the previous article a decade ago, Schultz maintained that the eighth-century prophet should be considered the primary source, but not the sole author or editor. He cited Walton and Sandy, but they highlighted the authority of the eighth-century prophet—what so-called progressive Evangelicals are holding, without using of the term ‘primary source.’

...when later reference is made to what has become the book of Isaiah, Isaiah is being identified as the authority figure behind the material, not as an "author" of a "book." It does not matter who put the book together and when, and it does not even matter whether communities of faith decided to include later oracles of

¹⁷⁵ Willem A. VanGemenen, “Isaiah” in *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: the Gospel Promised*, ed. Miles V. Van Pelt (Wheaton: Crossway, 2016), 249. In his 1990 work, without any mention of authorship, he regards the Book of Isaiah as the whole unit delivered by the prophet. See, *Interpreting the Prophetic World: An Introduction to the Prophetic Literature of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books, 1990), 247-289. See also, his students were standing in this line, Hee Sung Lee, *The Inheritance of the Servants in Isaiah 40-66: A Textlinguistic Analysis* (PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2007); Ayun Kim, *The Communal Lament of the Servants of YHWH in Isaiah 63:7-64:11* (PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2019).

¹⁷⁶ Richard L. Schultz, “The Origins and Basic Arguments of the Multi-Author View of the Composition of Isaiah: Where Are We Now and How Did We Get Here?” in *Bind Up the Testimony*, 2; see also his another article, “Isaianic Intertextuality and Intertextuality as Composition-Historical Indicators: Methodological Challenges in Determining Literary Influence,” 29-31.

Isaiah's successors in the collection; if they did so, it would only be because those later oracles were all still rightfully connected to Isaiah's authority in the eyes of those communities of faith.¹⁷⁷

In this vein, as Schultz already mentioned, even within the Evangelical circle, there are a number of scholars accepting the multiple authorship, whether dual divisions¹⁷⁸ or tripartite.¹⁷⁹

2.8. Reconsidering the Scope of Deutero-Isaiah

With the consideration of the final form, scholars began to reevaluate Torrey's dual division and Duhm's tripartite divisions both. Depending on how they demarcated its structure, whether diachronically or synchronically, the locus of the last eleven chapters were variously discussed. In this vein, the scope of Deutero-Isaiah was reevaluated with thematic and geographical concerns while the idea of Trito-Isaiah was rejected.

2.8.1. Single Authorship of Chs. 40-66

Julian Morgenstern (1961, 1965) of Hebrew Union College suggested that only chs. 40-48 would be regarded as the Deutero-Isaiah in the context around 539/8 B.C.E. According to him, chs. 49-55 would be related with the chs. 56-66 and chs. 34-35 in the context in 485

¹⁷⁷ John H. Walton and D. Brent Sandy, *The Lost World of Scripture: Ancient Literary Culture and Biblical Authority* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013), 64.

¹⁷⁸ Franz Delitzsch (1861-1888, trans. 1975), R.K. Harrison (1969), Frederic William Bush (1982 → revised 1996), John D. W. Watts (1985), Dillard and Longman (1994 → revised 2006), R. Reed Lessing (2004, 2011, 2014), Hugh G. M. Williamson (2006), Barry L. Ross (2016).

¹⁷⁹ William J. Dumbrell (1984), David Meade (1987), Dieter Schneider (1988, 1990), John Goldingay (1994, 2001, 2006), Edgar Conrad (1997), Barry G. Webb (1997), Paul R. House (2007, 2019), Abraham Sung-Ho Oh (2015), Gilberto Lozano (2020), Rickie D. Moore (2020).

B.C.E.¹⁸⁰ This dating is based on his series of articles (1956, 1957, 1960, 1966) on the catastrophe in Jerusalem in the first year of the reign of Xerxes I: Menahem led a second revolt (the first one led by Zerubbabel in 519) against Persia. As a result, the Second Temple, which was dedicated in 516, collapsed (including the walls). Ezra (458) and Nehemiah (445) were both responsible for the rebuilding of the Third Temple (?) and the walls. That was the background of Morgenstern's Trito-Isaiah.¹⁸¹ However, as John Bright pointed out, this theory is very "dubious"¹⁸² like Cheyne's theory on Artaxerxes III Ochus.

Meanwhile, Yehezkel Kaufmann (trans. 1960, 1970) of Hebrew University, criticized that theory of Trito-Isaiah, whether it was dated in the reconstruction of the Temple or the time of Nehemiah and Ezra because there is no explicit evidence. He considered that a 'supposed gap' between chs. 40-55 and chs. 56-66 "can be staked out only by artifices and casuistic analyses."¹⁸³ Preferably, because of the definite mention of King Cyrus, he posited the *Sitz im Leben* of chs. 40-66 after the conquest of Babylon in 539 B.C.E while he was admitting that chs. 40-48 are "a section set apart from the rest of the prophecies by subject matter and also by vocabulary."¹⁸⁴ In this respect, he focused on links between ch. 56 and ch. 55, noting that the two are sharing similar vocabularies. Duhm's tripartite theory was criticized because it was based on the

¹⁸⁰ Julian Morgenstern, *The Message of Deutero-Isaiah in Its Sequential Unfolding* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1961) 2-3, 6, 20, 29f; Julian Morgenstern, "Isaiah 49-55," *HUCA* 35 (1965), 1-35.

¹⁸¹ Julian Morgestern, "Jerusalem - 485 B.C." *HUCA* 27 (1956), 101-179; "Jerusalem - 485 B.C. (Continued)" *HUCA* 28 (1957), 15-47; "Jerusalem - 485 B.C. (Concluded)" *HUCA* 31 (1960), 1-29. "Further Light from the Book of Isaiah upon the Catastrophe of 485 B.C." *HUCA* 37 (1966), 1-28.

¹⁸² John Bright, *A History of Israel*, fourth edition. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000), 391.

¹⁸³ Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Babylonian Captivity and Deutero-Isaiah* (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1970; this is a partial excerpt from *The Religion of Israel* in Hebrew, 1960), 84.

¹⁸⁴ Kaufmann, *The Babylonian Captivity*, 74.

Protestant's theological framework of universalism and negative view on rituals.¹⁸⁵ In this respect, he redated the priestly source of Torah in the pre-exilic context.

Kaufmann's idea of a pre-exilic priestly source was succeeded by Menahem Haran (1963). He commended Kaufmann when he said that "does not indicate his own opinion regarding the actual compass of prophecies in this book and the way by which it is at all possible to determine their number," while he denounced Torrey's proposal, saying it is "arbitrary and lacks plausibility."¹⁸⁶ By holding that chs. 40-66 were composed by one prophetic author, he divides it into two parts with the concept of *ri'shonot* (the former things) and *hadashot* (the latter things), based on the geographical shift from Babylon (chs. 40-48) to Jerusalem/Palestine (chs. 49-66). Chronologically, chs. 40-66 was composed from the fall of Babylon in 539 (the proclamation was delivered in 538) and the first wave of emigration (*aliyah*) in 520 (under the leadership of Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel. Haran does not identify Zerubbabel as the leader of the second wave).¹⁸⁷ In this respect, he read that the *'ir* (city) and *hekhal* (temple, actually palace) in 66:6 constitute "no proof of the real existence of the Temple at the time."¹⁸⁸

Aimo E. Murtonen (1980)¹⁸⁹ and Mayer I. Gruber (1983)¹⁹⁰ also sees chs. 56-66 as the continuation of Deutero-Isaiah. For example, in his critical review on Pauritsch, Murtonen dismisses the concept of Trito-Isaiah as the author. He put chs. 56-66 in between 538 and 518,

¹⁸⁵ Kaufmann, *The Babylonian Captivity*, 88-89.

¹⁸⁶ Menahem Haran, "The Literary Structure and Chronological Framework of the Prophecies in Is. XL-XLVIII" in *Congress Volume. Bonn 1962*. VTSup 9. Edited by G.W. Anderson, P.A.H. de Boer, G.R. Castellino, Henry Cazelles, E. Hammershaimb, H. G. May, and W. Zimmerli (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 130-131.

¹⁸⁷ Haran, "The Literary Structure," 137-144.

¹⁸⁸ Haran, "The Literary Structure," 153-154 (footnote 2).

¹⁸⁹ Aimo E. Murtonen, "Third Isaiah - Yes or No?: Review Article of Karl Pauritsch, *Die neue Gemeinde: Gott sammelt Ausgestossene und Arme (Jesaja 56-66)*" *Abr-Nahrain* 19 (1980), 20-42.

¹⁹⁰ Mayer I. Gruber, "The Motherhood of God in Second Isaiah" *RB* 90.3 (1983), 351-9.

then divided chs. 56-66 into three parts with the geographic changes; Babylon (chs. 56-57), on the way to Palestine (chs. 58-60), Zion in the early days (61:1-63:14), and Zion at a later date (63:15-66:24).¹⁹¹

Benjamin D. Sommers (1996)¹⁹² and Shalom M. Paul (2012)¹⁹³ presumed that ch. 35 and chs. 40-66 as Deutero-Isaiah was regarded as “one coherent opus composed by a single prophet” in the second half of the sixth century.¹⁹⁴ As Torrey did, the allusions between chs. 34-35 and chs. 40-66 is reviewed. In the case of ch. 35, they argued it is a clear case as a single poetics allusion with chs. 40-66 (c.f. Scott, Smart). They were rejecting redactional approaches on chs. 56-66 that assumed several Trito-Isaiahs. The theory of Trito-Isaiah is considered an ‘artificial’ thing because of thematic and linguistic continuity between chs. 40-55 and chs. 56-66.¹⁹⁵ It does not mean he entirely dismissed the thematic discontinuity within ch. (34-)35 and chs. 40-66. Sommer said,

I do not mean to deny that there are differences of thematic emphasis or ideological concern within Isaiah 40-66 and 35, nor would I gainsay the claim that the earlier chapters, which emphasize consolation, were written in the exile, while the later ones were written in the Land of Israel and include a strong element of disappointment. But the division between earlier, exilic, chapter and later, Palestine, chapters probably occurs at the end of chapter 48 rather than 55, as scholars such as Haran have noted.¹⁹⁶

In this vein, as Kaufmann and Haran suggested, Sommer and Paul posited the setting of chs. 40-48 in Babylon and the rest of chapters (chs. 49-66) in Jerusalem. This division is also

¹⁹¹ Murtonen, "Third Isaiah - Yes or No?," 22, 28, 38-41.

¹⁹² Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 187-198, 315-331.

¹⁹³ Shalom M. Paul, *Isaiah 40-66: Translation and Commentary*. ECC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012), 1-72.

¹⁹⁴ Paul, *Isaiah 40-66*, 12.

¹⁹⁵ Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 191-2; Paul, *Isaiah 40-66*, 11.

¹⁹⁶ Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 193.

found in Dalit Rom-Shiloni's work in 2013.¹⁹⁷ Although this does not intend to admit the possibility of the third book because of stylistic unity, the geographical and thematic differences between chs. 40-48 and chs. 49-60 remain as to who this single author would be, and who it was who migrated from Babylon to Jerusalem in the mid and later sixth century B.C.E.

Hyun-Chul Paul Kim, following Shalom Paul's idea on linguistic connections within chs. 54-57, argues that there is no distinct break between ch. 55 and ch. 56.¹⁹⁸ His inner-biblical exegesis in the 2015 article shows that chs. 54-57 have an intertextual affinity with chs. 1-2 and Ps. 1, and then discusses shared keywords and expressions among chs. 54-57. He argues that the distinction between right and wrong and the invitation for all people is already found in ch. 55.¹⁹⁹ According to him, this distinction should be regarded as not just a socio-political issue, but also a theological theme of the right and the wicked, that is already clearly shown in Ps. 1, and within the entire final form of the Book of Isaiah.²⁰⁰ Based on a blurred concept of "we"-group in Asian culture and the cultural double bind by Homi K. Bhabha, he said,

In other words, this "we"-group may not denote a fixed faction but instead a flexible, bending, and fleeing component with entry qualifications that may ever get narrower or wider...we should also keep in mind that, by being unspecified and anonymized, such ambiguity may caution readers that one can be a loyal member of the righteous group but can easily desert to the other, and vice versa, especially when it comes to the issue of power, greed, and survival.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁷ Dalit Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity: Identity Conflicts between the Exiles and the People who Remained (6th-5th Centuries BCE)*, LHBOTS 543 (New York: T&T Clark, 2013), 99-138.

¹⁹⁸ Hyun Chul Paul Kim, "A Farewell to Trito-Isaiah?: An Inner-Biblical Exegesis of Isaiah 54-57 in Light of Isaiah 1-2 and Psalm 1" *Canon & Culture* 9.1 (2015), 35-70; *Reading Isaiah: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Chewy Publishing, 2016), 3, 251-266.

¹⁹⁹ HCP Kim, "'A Farewell to Trito-Isaiah?," 50-53.

²⁰⁰ HCP Kim, "'A Farewell to Trito-Isaiah?," 59-61.

²⁰¹ HCP Kim, *Reading Isaiah*, 19.

In other words, though he admits that the author(s) of chs. 49-66 would be located in Jerusalem, he does not want to specify who was this author(s) and to which group he belonged. Instead, by blurring socio-historical presuppositions with general shared theological concepts, he invites contemporary readers to read it from the perspective of their cultural contexts.

2.8.2. Scribal Tradents Continuing Previous Traditions

The rejection of Duhm's tripartite theory was also reconsidered within German scholarship. Fritz Maass (1967), influenced by Morgenstern and Haran, rejected the concept of Trito-Isaiah as an independent book or author. Instead, he presumed chs. 56-66 should belong to the second additions (*sekundäre Zusätze*) of Deutero-Isaiah, who was moving from Babylon to Jerusalem (*einen Standortwechsel Babel-Jerusalem*).²⁰²

Odil Hannes Steck's proposal (1989, 1991, 1992, 1997) went further from the idea of intertextual dependency between chs. 56-66 and previous Isaian tradition. His approach is different from Torrey's or Kaufmann's dealing with Deutero-Isaiah. Though he continued to use the term Trito-Isaiah for academic convenience, he did not posit the hypothetical original author within chs. 56-66. In this respect, instead of deciding which one is original or not, he dealt with it as the long continuation of the previous Isaianic traditions from 539 to 270. Simultaneously, Proto-Isaiah and Deutero-Isaiah were independently circulated until 312/11. The Deutero-Isainic tradition has a central role in the whole process of composition of the Book of Israel as noted by Clifford, Melugin, Rentroff, and Williamson. His dating is dependent on whether or not the

²⁰² Fritz Maass, "Tritojesaja?" in *Das ferne und nahe Wort Festschrift. Leonhard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres am 31.11.1966 gewidmet*, BZAW 105. ed. Fritz Maass (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1967) 153-163.

Ptolemaic Empire was taking and retaking Coele-Syria in the circumstances of the Diadochi Wars (322-275).²⁰³ Here I will review how Steck dealt with the formation of Trito-Isaiaian parts.

First, he put 60:1-9, 13-16; 61:1-11 (60:10f; 62:1-7 is little later) in the ongoing tradition of the *Ebed-YHWH* songs (*EJL*). Though he did not call it the fifth servant song which Deutero-Isaiah wrote, he considers this pericope was composed in the later period before the arrival of Nehemiah in 445 (the first half of the fifth century). At this time, chs. 60-62 was added into chs. 40-55.

Second, 62:10-11 (and ch.35) was added when the Proto- and Deutero-Isaiah joined together with chs.60-62. Steck presupposed that this happened during the time of 312/1 when the Third Diadochi War (314-311) was finished: when Coele-Syria was taken by Ptolemy I Soter (r. 305/4-282) of Egypt from Macedonia (the Battle of Gaza). Steck called this stage the “homecoming redaction (*Heinkehrredaktion*),” but he did not explain why the events around 312/1 resulted from the homecoming of the diaspora Jew to Zion/Jerusalem. However, as Berges pointed out, we do not have much historical and archeological evidence on this.²⁰⁴ Ptolemy I’s rule over Coele-Syria (including Ptolemy I’s second capture of Jerusalem) was short. When Antigonus I Monophthalmus entered into the Coele-Syria after the defeat of his son Demetrius, Ptolemy I was withdrawn from the Coele-Syria. Meanwhile, Seleucus was starting to fight

²⁰³ His proposal is summarized in Odil Hannes Steck, *Studien zu Tritojesaja* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991), 278-79. See also Steck, *Studien zu Tritojesaja* (1991), 3-48, in *The Book of Isaiah=Le Livre D'Isaïe: Les Oracles Et Leurs Relectures, Unité Et Complexité de L'Ouvrage*, ed. Jacques Vermeulen (Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 361-406. Steck, “Die Gottesknechts-Texte und ihre redaktionelle Rezeption im Zweiten Jesaja,” in *Gottesknecht und Zion: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Deuterojesaja*, FAT 4 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 149-72. “Autor und/oder Redaktor in Jesaja 56-66,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, vol. 1, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, VTSup 70/1 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 219-59.

²⁰⁴ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 390, 452.

against Macedonia (Babylonian War).²⁰⁵ However, Steck did not give any specific descriptions of why (massive numbers of) Diaspora Jews were going back to their homeland, especially Zion/Jerusalem.

Third, 56:9-58:12, 14bb, 59:1-12; 60:17-22; 61:2; 62:8f; 63:1-6 is ascribed to the stage of the penultimate redaction (*Vorletzte Redaktion*). This addition is posited between 312/1 and 302/1. However, Steck did not give any specific historical explanation to support this claim.

Fourth, the communal lament in 63:7-64:11 and the framework of 56:1-8 and 65:1-66:24 was finally added into the stage of final redaction (*Schlußredaktion*) that was responsible for the final form of not only the Trito-Isaiah book but also the entire Book of Isaiah (*Großjesaja*). According to Steck, this lament in 63:7-64:11 appeared as the reaction of the Ptolemy I Soter's invasion of Jerusalem in 302/1 as a traumatic event to Jews. This late dating of 63:7-64:11 is also found in Johannes Goldenstein (2001) and Konrad Schmid (2008 → 2012b).²⁰⁶ It is true Ptolemy I's retake of Coele-Syria (Ptolemy I's third capture of Jerusalem) happened in the aftermath of the Battle of Ipsus in 312/1, though Ptolemy was not directly involved in this battle. However, Josephus's description of Ptolemy I's entering into Jerusalem on the Sabbath would be dated 320 (Ptolemy I's first capture of Jerusalem). There was no trouble with Jews according to Josephus's *Antiquities* XII, 1 and *Contra Apion* I, 22 (as a critical response of Agatharchides of Cnidus). Though Ptolemy I "ruled over it in a cruel manner" by taking some Judeans and Samaritans over

²⁰⁵ Günther Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, trans. Tina Saavedra (New York: Routledge, 2000; originally published in German in 1994), 20-34.

²⁰⁶ Johannes Goldenstein, *Das Gebet der Gottesknechte: Jesaja 63,7-64,11 im Jesajabuch*, WMANT 92 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001), 232-247; Konrad Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History*, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008 → 2012b), 202-205, 207-208. = *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt: WBG, 2008).

into Egypt, he employed lots of Jerusalemites into his garrison and gave them citizenship like Macedonians because he trusted them. Martin Hengel also pointed out that “the remarkable thing is that Jewish judgments on the foreign state and its rulers in the early Hellenistic period are still overwhelmingly positive.”²⁰⁷ Jewish diasporas in Egypt received good treatment even from his successor, Ptolemy II Philadelphus (r.284-246), who was well-known as the king who ordered the Hebrew Bible to be translated into Koine Greek by Alexandrian Jews. Once Ptolemy III Euergetes (r.246-222) was threatening to invade Jerusalem because Onias II the high priest did not pay taxes, but it did not happen. Josephus’ description of cruelty is more appropriate in Antiochus IV Epiphanes (r.175-164) because of his Hellenization program in *Antiquities* XII, 5.²⁰⁸ It means Steck and Berges both mistakenly cite *Antiquities* XII, 5-6, not XII, 1, as the account of Ptolemy I Soter.²⁰⁹

Fifth, in his later article in 1991 work, however, Steck presupposed the dating 56:1-8 and 65:1-66:24 a little later than 63:7-64:11 because of its condemnation of syncretic cults in Ptolemaic Jerusalem.²¹⁰ It means the final redaction (*Schlußredaktion*) happened between 302/1 to 270 in Ptolemaic Jerusalem. In 271, Ptolemy II Philadelphus took Coele-Syria back from the hand of the Seleucid Empire as the result of the First Syrian War (274-1 BCE).²¹¹ At least until

²⁰⁷ Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, vol. 1. trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974; translation from the second edition in German, 1973), 29.

²⁰⁸ See also First and Second Maccabees. Third Maccabees describes Ptolemy IV Philopator (r. 221-204) as a cruel ruler.

²⁰⁹ Steck, “Tritojesaja im Jesajabuch,” in *The Book of Isaiah* (1989), 399.

²¹⁰ Steck, *Studien zu Tritojesaja* (1991), 192f.

²¹¹ Steck, *Studien zu Tritojesaja* (1991), 30-40, 192.

Antiochus III (r.222-187), though they had an imperial intention to control it effectively, Hellenistic rulers were allowed to keep the ancestral laws and customs in Judea.²¹²

In this respect, we can conclude that Steck's redactional reconstruction is "arbitrary and unpersuasive."²¹³ As Blenkinsopp pointed out, Steck abandoned the concept of oral tradition without any hesitation because of his redactional maximalism. Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer's criticism also should be mentioned: "...the historical allusions are merely corroborating evidence that can support several dating schemes...there are no explicit references to any known person or event during the Hellenistic period in all of Isaiah 56-66."²¹⁴

Konrad Schmid (2006, 2008, 2011, 2014) tried to synthesize traditional views and Steck's late dating. So, the Book of Isaiah has been consistently developed and composed from the eighth century to the third century B.C.E.²¹⁵ He did not deal with chs. 56-66 as the independent work by a single author but the work of scribal tradents with "ongoing literary

²¹² Anthea Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014), 55-62.

²¹³ Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66*, 58.

²¹⁴ Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, "Will the Prophetic Texts from the Hellenistic Period Stand Up, Please!," in *Judah Between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule (ca. 400-200 BCE)*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Oded Lipschits (Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2011), 272.

²¹⁵ Konrad Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History*, 91-96, 115-16, 167-69, 202-5, 207-8, 218.

allusions to Isa 40-55.”²¹⁶ Though he considered Isa 40-66 as Deutero-Isaiah in his previous work (2006 → trans. 2012a), he was still using the term Trito-Isaiah.²¹⁷

Although the literary status of the Trito-Isaiah as a distinctive self-contained work was challenged and even denied because of the intra- and intertextual affinities with previous Isaian traditions, it is still admitted by those who are focusing on the role of Deutero-Isaiah (chs. 40-55) in the final-form Isaiah such as Roy F. Melugin (1976),²¹⁸ Brevard S. Childs (1979, 2001: his interest on the canonical structure),²¹⁹ Richard J. Clifford (1984),²²⁰ R. Rendtorff (1993),²²¹ H.G.M. Williamson (1994),²²² and Patricia K. Tull (1997).²²³

²¹⁶ Konrad Schmid, “New Creation Instead of New Exodus: The Innerbiblical Exegesis and Theological Transformations of Isaiah 65:17-25,” in *Continuity and Discontinuity: Chronological and Thematic Development in Isaiah 40-66*, ed. Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer and Hans M. Barstad (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 175. See also “Trito-Isaiah (Third Isaiah),” in *Religion Past and Present: Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*, ed. Hans Dieter Betz, Don S. Browning, Bernd Janowski and Eberhard Jüngel (Leiden: Brill, 2011). It is translated from the fourth edition of RGG. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1877-5888_rpp_SIM_125181.

²¹⁷ Konrad Schmid, “The Book of Isaiah,” in *T&T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Literature, Religion and History of the Old Testament*, trans. Jennifer Adams-Maßmann (New York: T&T Clark, 2012a), 401-29. = *Grundinformation Altes Testament: Eine Einführung in Literatur, Religion und Geschichte des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).

²¹⁸ Roy F. Melugin, *The Formation of Isaiah 40-55*, BZAW 141 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1976).

²¹⁹ Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 311-38; Also his *Isaiah: A Commentary*. . (Louisville, KY: Westminster, John Knox Press, 2001), 1-5, 289-91, 439-49.

²²⁰ Richard J. Clifford, “The Unity of the Book of Isaiah and Its Cosmogonic Language”, *CBQ* 55 (1993), 1-17.

²²¹ Rolf Rendtorff, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986; originally published in German, 1983), 190-200; his *Canon and Theology: Overtures to an Old Testament Theology*, OBT, trans. Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1993), 146-169 (from 1984), 181-9 (from 1996); *The Canonical Hebrew Bible: A Theology of the Old Testament*, TBS 7. trans. David E. Orton (Leiden: Deo, 2005; originally published in German, 1999).

²²² H. G. M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah’s Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 1-29.

²²³ Patricia Tull Willey (a.k.a Patricia K. Tull), *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*, SBLDS 161 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1997).

2.9. Revisiting Redactions of Trito-Isaiah

As we discussed above, scholars after the 1960s were more focused on the intra- and inter-textual aspects of the present final form of the Book of Isaiah. In this respect, the role of scribal traditions had been getting more attention in terms of its continuity with the previous Isaian traditions.

Some scholars dismissed the theory that chs. 56-66 were a separate work. Scholars like Steck agreed to use Trito-Isaiah as the technical term in the scholarship. This term is just a nomenclature that the later scholars proposed. In this respect, chs. 56-66 were considered belonging to the second part of the entire book. Nevertheless, there is no complete agreement on its historical setting.

Yet efforts to find *ipsissima verba* of the prophet called Trito-Isaiah was not entirely rejected. Instead, scholars in the late 1980s and early 1990s were trying to combine the long discussed subject of the orality with the new trend on scribalism. Seizo Sekine (1989), Klaus Koenen (1990), Wolfgang Lau (1994), Paul A. Smith (1995) Ulich Berges (2012), and Jacob Stormberg (2011) all admitted that chs. 60-62 were the core of Trito-Isaiah, as Westermann had suggested.²²⁴ In this vein, they presupposed that the possibility of finding the distinct original speech of an anonymous prophet in chs. 60-62 while admitting that this author and following redactor would have succeeded the previous traditions and be responsible for the very complicated compositional process of the final form of the Book of Isaiah.

²²⁴ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 390.

Two or three different stages follow each redactional proposal; 1) author himself, 2) later redactor(s), and 3) independent sources from neither author nor redactor(s). The first two stages are interrelated, so the second one has a supplementary role in relation to the previous one. The third one, however, is distinguished from the first two. Texts belonging to the third one would be considered independent and even fragmentary because each comes from different socio-historical settings. In this respect, Koenen's methodological differentiation between supplementary (i.e., Lau) or fragmentary hypothesis (i.e., Sekine) should be reconsidered.²²⁵ The methodological differences would be perceived not only depending on whether or not which layer is continued or has discontinued other ones, but also on how each scholar's point of view approaches the reconstructing of redactional layers.

²²⁵ Klaus Koenen, *Ethik und Eschatologie im Tritojesajabuch: Eine literarkritische und Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie*. WMANT 62 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 3-7.

Table 6. Six Redactional Proposals by Scholars after the Late 1980s

	Sekine (1989)	Koenen (1990)	Lau (1994)	Smith (1995)	Berges (1998 → trans. 2012)	Stromberg (2011)
Not of TI	Grundschrift B (10 individual texts, but more focusing on first seven) (before 538) i) 63:7-10 (538-515) ii) 59:1-15a iii) 63:11b-64:3, 9-11 iv) 64:4b-8 v) 66:1-4 (after 515) vi) 56:1-5aa, 5ba vii) 56:9-57:13a viii) 58:3-14 ix) 63:1-6^ x) 65:2-16a ^460-450	Einzeltexte 56:9-12 63:7-64:11 (hesitate to date 63:7-64:11 and put it as the work of neither author nor redactor of TI.) (p.158-9)	Einzelüberlieferungen (after 587) 63:1-6 (time of TI or Tradentenkreis I) 63:7-64:11 (Ezra-Neh) 56:1-8*	Exilic lament 63:7-64:11		Early materials before TI (earliest) 60-62 (Between the core and the bookend) 63:1-6 63:7-64:11 (not provide specific dates nor set as the author before the final form stage) (p.30f, 34f)

Original Author Himself	Grundschrift A (519-515) 60:1-22; 66:7-16 (right after 515) 61:1-11 (even later) 62:1-12; 57:14-15ba, 16-18ba, 19ba; 65:16b-23, 25;	Grundschrift = Das Werk Tritojesajas (520-515) 57:14-19; 58:3-12; 59:1-4*, 9-15a; 60:1-18; 61:1-4*, 5-6^; 62:1-7, 8-9*, 10-12; 65:16b-24; 66:7-9, 10-14a ^put 61:7-9 neither an author or a redactor. (p.115-18; Berges, p.415)	Tritojesaja (1st half of 5th c.) 60-62*	TI1 (early post-exilic) a) 60:1-63:6	Trito-Isaiah (1st half of 5th c.) 60:1-9, 13-16; 61:1-9; 62:1-7 62:10-12 Call to Diaspora and Nations	Redactional Framework by TI 56:1-8 65-66 +.56:9-59:20
--------------------------------	--	--	---	--	---	---

Redactor(s) of the Final Form	Redaktionelle Schicht (late 5th c. or early 4th c. = depending on how set Ezra's arrival) 56:5ab, 5bb, 6-8; 57:13b, 15bb, bc, 18bb-19ba, 20f; 58:1f, 59:15b-21; 63:11a; 64:4a; 65:1, 24; 66:4f, 17, 18-24.	Die zweite Schicht = Das Werk des Redaktors (as the actual author of the final form of TI.) (late 5th c. or early 4th c. = depending on how set Ezra's arrival) (p.223) 1)Text and additions of structure of Trito-Isaiah book. 56:1, 2 + 57:1f + 57:20f;58:1f + 59:15b-20* + 63:1-6; 66:5f + 66:14b-17*; 57:13b; 60:21; 61:10f; 65:16a 2)individual texts 56:3-8; 57:3-13a*; 65:1-7*; 65:8-15*; 66:18-22* 3)additions 56:11ab, b; 57:17-18aa; 58:13f; 59:13a; 60:6bb,7b,9b,10b,13; 62:9ab,bb; 66:3f	Tradentenkreis I (eschatological salvation of Jerusalem/Zion) 57:14-21*; 66:7-14a; 65:16b-25 Tradentenkreis II (predominantly cultic languages) 66:18-24*; 57:3-13; 66:1-4,5f,14b-17; 65:1-7, 8-12.13-16a Tradentenkreis III (social disputes within the community) 59:1-21*; 56:9-12+57:1-2;58:1-14*	TI2 (until 515, universalism) b) 56:1-8 c) 58:1-59:20 d) 56:9-57:21 e) 63:7-64:11; 65:1-66:17 f) 59:21; 66:18-24^ ^Later appendix (mid 5th c.)	Repentance Redaction (2nd half of 5th c.) 56.9~59:21 (except 58:13-14) → 60:17-22 Redaction of the Servant Community (end 5th c.-beg. of 4th c.) 56:1-8 63:1-66:24 ← 61:10-11; 63:1-6^; 63:7-64:11^; 65	
--------------------------------------	---	--	--	--	---	--

Seizo Sekine (関根清三, 1989), while he wrestled with Elliger's stylistic analysis of sixty years before,²²⁶ tried to set a bridge between traditional diachronic methods and the newly synchronic one. In other words, while he established three large redactional layers with sublayers of Trito-Isaiah, he organized them into thirteen themes to reconstruct the theologies of each layer and sublayers.²²⁷ About the author Trito-Isaiah who was responsible for chs. 60-62, he suggested that this author would be placed in Jerusalem during and after the Temple reconstruction. Sekine noted that this author was very familiar with the theme of eschatological salvation.²²⁸ Although he did not consider 61:1-6 to be Trito-Isaiah's voice, he implied that this voice contradicted Haggai and Zechariah's message.²²⁹ On the *Sitz im Leben* of the redactor responsible for the finalization (who was responsible for *Redaktionelle Schicht*), Sekine presupposes that this would have happened in Jerusalem during the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, even though he does not set a specific date on it. This redactor's message is more universal, with appeal for the proselyte and even the converted foreigners excluded from the Yahwistic community by Ezra and Nehemiah's strict reform.²³⁰ However, the problem is that Sekine's method is too complicated to explain. For example, Sekine does not fully explain why *Grundschrift B* should be divided into ten individual texts and what set of standards he uses to select thirteen specific theological themes to analyze each layer and sublayer. Furthermore, he has not adequately dealt with how previous

²²⁶ Bastard's criticism of Sekine. Hans M. Barstad, "Isaiah 56-66 in Relation to Isaiah 40-55. Why a New Reading is Necessary" in *Continuity and Discontinuity*, 51.

²²⁷ Thirteen theological concepts: 1) salvation; 2) mercy; 3) blessing; 4) covenant; 5) judgment; 6) holiness; 7) glory; 8) God; 9) sin; 10) good and bad; 11) people; 12) history; 13) eschatology. Sekine, *Die Tritojesajanische Sammlung*, 182f.

²²⁸ Sekine, *Die Tritojesajanische Sammlung*, 101-104.

²²⁹ Sekine, *Die Tritojesajanische Sammlung*, 45.

²³⁰ Sekine, *Die Tritojesajanische Sammlung*, 66-67.

Isaian and other traditions were transmitted in terms of intra- and intertextual concerns and how the final form of Trito-Isaiah had been formulated in response to concerns about the composition of the Book of Isaiah.

Klaus Koenen's approach (1990) is similar to what Sekine presented. He also posits two independent individual texts that did not belong to the work of an original author and a later redactor. Koenen hesitated to date 63:7-64:11 while noticing Steck's suggestion of its late dating.²³¹ Except for the cases of two individual texts, he divided Trito-Isaiah into two layers, then assigned each to a single author (who follows the Deutero-Isaianic tradition) in 520-515 and a single redactor during the time of Ezra-Nehemiah, although he did not decide when Ezra's arrival happened—either in the late fifth or the early fourth century.²³² As Berges commented, his decision as 'Solomonic,' Koenen's prudence on dating is also found when he ascribed 61:7-9 neither an author nor a redactor. Interestingly, even he did not put it in any redactional layers. He dealt with it as a combination of several *Deuterojasaja* quotations with a psalm quotation.²³³ His reconstruction of the author and the redactor is similar to what Sekine had previously proposed. Therefore, the author of Trito-Isaiah is the counterpart of Haggai and Zechariah. The redactor is the counterpart of Ezra and Nehemiah. This is because of both eschatological views on temple and salvation.²³⁴ Sekine and Koenen's treatment is very similar to what previous scholars did. Especially, their emphasis on the new inclusive worship community reminds us of Pauritsch's '*Die Neue Gemeinde*.' However, it should be pointed out that the social status of the pious group

²³¹ Koenen, *Ethik und Eschatologie*, 158-9.

²³² Koenen, *Ethik und Eschatologie*, 223.

²³³ Koenen, *Ethik und Eschatologie*, 115; Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 415.

²³⁴ Koenen, *Ethik und Eschatologie*, 215-240.

in the post-exilic Jerusalem had been changed (Blenkinsopp) and that returnees dealt differently with the converted foreigners of Yahwism and the mixed marriage of Jewish men (Sweeney). Furthermore, these points are necessary to consider the socio-political traits and functions of the post-exilic Yehud community under the control of the Persian Empire (J. Weinberg).

Wolfgang Lau (1994) was more concerned with transmission and intra- and intertextual relationships. His basic premise is that each redactional layer was rooted in the scribal prophetic traditions (*schriftgelehrte Propheten*). Except for the case of Trito-Isaiah himself (the first half of the fifth century) and three independent texts, he did not give any specific dating on the following layers.²³⁵ Instead, he gave more attention to three different circles of tradents (*Tradentenkreis*), who were considered to be the different authors of each layer.²³⁶ The first one is the group of themes of the eschatological salvation of Jerusalem/Zion. This is using not only Trito-Isaiah, but also the previous Isaianic prophetic traditions. The second is the group predominantly using cultic languages. It describes the congregational conflicts within the Yahwistic cult. This is more influenced by the Torah, the Proto-Isaiah, and also Deuteronomic languages of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Unlike Trito-Isaiah, God's actions are described as ambivalent. The third one is the group focused on social disputes within the community. Though this circle seems to share languages with the second one, it did not have the creation theme. Also, it shares with Trito-Isaiah and the first circle. Because this shares the language of *Ketuvim*, Lau evaluates this as less prophetic than others. Lastly, three individual texts are discussed while

²³⁵ Lau, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie*, 115-116.

²³⁶ Lau, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie*, 141-2, 201-2, 260-1.

rejecting Steck's dating.²³⁷ As Marvin E. Tate pointed out, this shows what the redactors were doing as the active re-reader of previous traditions to apply to new circumstances.²³⁸ However, his distinction would be that he considered diverse social groups within the postexilic Yehud in relation to the Persian influences (Berquist).

Paul Allan Smith's proposal (1995) was regarded as a simplified version of Koenen.²³⁹ Except for two cases of an exilic lament in 63:7-64:11 and a later appendix in 66:18-24, he presupposed that most of chs. 56-66 originated between the first arrival of exiles in 538 and the dedication of the second Temple in 515. In this respect, he divided chs. 56-66 into two layers.²⁴⁰ The first one, what which he called TI1, is the work of the author himself called Trito-Isaiah within the circumstances of the first arrival of exiles in 538. As other scholars agreed, this author's message is placed in the core of the text (chs. 60-62). Smith here adds 63:1-6 into TI1 because of sharing its stylistic commonness and its 'nationalistic' rhetoric with the previous three chapters.²⁴¹ The rest is ascribed to the so-called TI2. This second author is working from the second arrival of exiles in 520 to the completion of the temple building in 515. Unlike TI1, TI2's message has more universalistic and eschatological attitudes for all, especially in the bookend (ch.56:1-8, chs.66:18-24) by reinterpreting chs. 60-62.²⁴²

²³⁷ Lau, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie*, 314.

²³⁸ Marvin E. Tate, "The Book of Isaiah in Recent Study," in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts*, ed. Paul R. House and John W. Watts, LHBOTS 235 (New York: T&T Clark, 1996), 42.

²³⁹ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 390.

²⁴⁰ Paul Allan Smith, *Rhetoric and Redaction in Trito-Isaiah The Structure, Growth, and Authorship of Isaiah 56-66*, VTSup 62 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 198-199, 205-207.

²⁴¹ Smith, *Rhetoric and Redaction*, 43-44, 176.

²⁴² Smith, *Rhetoric and Redaction*, 58, 167, 171, 207.

Ulrich F. Berges (1998) viewed chs. 56-66 as having been composed in three stages.²⁴³ Here I will review his discussion on Trito-Isaiah without dealing with his complex proposal of the long redactional process of the final form of the Book of Isaiah. Although he is not following Ptolemaic dating, his proposal is largely influenced by Steck.

First, he ascribed most of chs. 60-62 (what he calls ‘Light chapters,’ except 60:10-12, 17-22; 61:10-11) to an anonymous prophetic author who was influenced by Deutero-Isaianic tradition to deliver the message of salvation of Zion/Light in the context of Sukkot festival during the time of the first half of the fifth century. In other words, he presupposed that this single author knew about the penultimate stage (what he calls ‘Second Jerusalem Redaction’) of Deutero-Isaiah after the failure of Babylonian revolts against Xerxes I in the middle of the 480s.²⁴⁴ Berges expected that this event would be a decisive fall of Babylon by the Jewish diaspora because “the nations have nothing left but to bring their treasures to Zion!”²⁴⁵ In this vein, his dating of the Trito-Isainic prophet’s period should be between 480s and 445. He interprets Trito-Isaiah’s messages in ch. 61 to say it “not only holds out the prospect of reform in the current cult and legal praxis, but also even includes the replacement of the present Zadokite priesthood by the mourners of Zion”²⁴⁶

Second, he attributed 56:9-59:21 with 60:17-22 (except 58:13-14) to so-called ‘Repentance Redaction’ in the second half of the fifth century (the period between Trito-Isaiah and the later redaction of the servant community). He suggested that this part was composed by

²⁴³ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 520.

²⁴⁴ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 403-4.

²⁴⁵ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 404.

²⁴⁶ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 423.

Trito-Isainic disciples who expanded the master's message and knew not only previous Isaianic tradition but also other prophetic texts.²⁴⁷ According to Berges, during this time, the social tensions between the pious and the sinners in Israelites were becoming more harsh than before because of delayed salvation (salvation gap): "The offer of salvation, directed to the whole postexilic community and conditioned by a demand for repentance, finds a hearing and followers only within a small group."²⁴⁸ The disciple of Trito-Isaiah agreed with priestly leaders who resisted syncretic religious practices.²⁴⁹ In this vein, the purpose of this redaction would be stated as follows: "YHWH comes as redeemer (goel) only to those who turn away from the sins of Jacob."²⁵⁰

Third, 56:1-8 and 63:1-66:24 is ascribed to the 'Redaction of Servant Community' during the end of the fifth century to the beginning of the fourth century. Here Berges defines the servant community as following YHWH of the Diaspora Jews and nations as the opposite of the unfaithful syncretic opponents among the returning *golah* in chs. 65-66. Although, as in the case of repentance redaction, here the faithful servants' attack on syncretism is linked with priestly tradition.²⁵¹ The criticism against the Jerusalem cult and the invitation of all people, which is found in the bookend, is read within the real situation of religious leaders who were serving the Persian interests. In this respect, the Levitical priesthood from Diaspora Jews, "as a result of the preaching of proselytes," is required to break the priestly monopoly of returned Jews in

²⁴⁷ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 442.

²⁴⁸ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 436.

²⁴⁹ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 440.

²⁵⁰ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 435.

²⁵¹ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 469.

Jerusalem.²⁵² He followed neither the early dating of 63:1-6 nor the late dating of 63:7-64:11.²⁵³ In the case of 63:1-6, he presupposed that Edom had collapsed “probably from Arab invasions” without any definite historical evidence.²⁵⁴

Berges’s reconstruction calls attention to the complex literary history of the present form of the Book of Isaiah. However, as in the case of Steck, his reconstructions of each redactional stage do not have enough historical and archeological evidence. Also, though he tries to introduce an abundance of his developed nomenclature and jargon, he does not provide clear definitions of them.

Jacob Stromberg (2011), a student of H. G. M. Williamson, focused on the redactional role of the chapters that make bookends of Trito-Isaiah while he reviewed Steck and Smith. He did not divide the author and the redactor as separate entities. Instead, he combined these two concepts then proposed the author of TI as the final redactor of Trito-Isaiah, also the entire Book of Isaiah. Although he argued that there is “only one layer of redaction” in chs. 56-66 without any specific historical reconstruction,²⁵⁵ his views of redaction would be divided into three levels by sequence of time: 1) the earliest material of chs.60-62; 2) materials between the core and the panel (63:1-6; 63:7-64:11); and 3) framework of 56:1-8 and chs. 65-66 and additional block (56:9-59:20) by the final redactor.²⁵⁶ In his work *Isaiah After Exile: The Author of Third Isaiah as Reader and Redactor of the Book*, he focused more on the framework itself. He suggested that

²⁵² Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 487, 490.

²⁵³ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 452, 464-6.

²⁵⁴ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 455.

²⁵⁵ Jacob Stromberg, *An Introduction to the Study of Isaiah* (New York: T&T Clark, 2011b), 51.

²⁵⁶ Jacob Stromberg, *Isaiah After Exile: The Author of Third Isaiah as Reader and Redactor of the Book* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011a), 11-39.

this final redactor (Stromberg preferred “author”) was the reader of the Isaianic tradition. Like the case of Lau’s scribal prophecy, he describes the role of the redactor as more interpretive than active. In this respect, he suggested that this author is responsible for not only the final form of chs. 56-66, but also for that of Isa 1-39 and 40-55.

Lastly, two recent proposals should be mentioned: Andrea Schüle (2020) and Moon Kwon Chae (2021). First, Schüle’s idea was based on his Protestant review of Duhm’s evaluation of Trito-Isaiah as a downgraded version from Deutero-Isaianic free grace to “works righteousness.”²⁵⁷ Instead, he divided the compositions into two parts to show two different and even contrasting theologies within chs. 56-66; 1) 58:1-59:21 (criticism); 60:1-62:12 (promise), 2) 63:7-64:11 (criticism); 65:1-25; 66:1-24 (promise). Concerning *Sitz im Leben*, he simply stated that salvation is delayed in post-exilic Yehud under the Persian rule.²⁵⁸ Also, he ruled out connecting part of 63:1-6 between two compositions and the beginning part of 56:1-8, 9-12; 57:1-13 that connects with Deutero-Isaiah.²⁵⁹ While the first composition highlights the unconditional promise to all Israelites, the second one describes it in a more conditional sense between the pious and the unfaithful. In order to explain the second one’s conditionality, he discussed how the prayer of repentance in chs. 63-64 is different with Neh. 9. Concerning the social location of God-fearing people (66:2-5) who are referred to as servants of God in chs. 65-66, he regarded them as part of a collective movement of various groups of people, who are “not

²⁵⁷ Andrea Schüle, “Isaiah 56-66” in *The Oxford Handbook of Isaiah*, ed. Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 130.

²⁵⁸ Schüle, “Isaiah 56-66,” 131.

²⁵⁹ Schüle, “Isaiah 56-66,” 141.

defined by birth of origin, but by choice and effort.”²⁶⁰ Schüle’s idea is based on his protestant review of Duhm’s evaluation of Trito-Isaiah as a downgraded version from Deutero-Isaianic free grace to “works righteousness.”²⁶¹

Chae’s redactional scheme with three levels is centered in the theme of exclusion /inclusion of foreigners. First, he put Isa 60-62; 63:1-6; 63:7-64:11 as the earliest text in that it shares nationalistic views during the sixth century. Then, Isa 56:9-59:21; 65-66:17 are listed as the middle text that shows tension between the righteous and unrighteous within Israelite during the first half of the fifth century. Finally, the framework of Isa 56:1-8 and 66:18-24 shows inclusion of righteous foreigners into the Yahwistic community in the second half of the fifth century.²⁶²

2.10. Closing Remarks

From the point of view of literary history, the use of Trito-Isaiah means the theory of a transitional state of textual formation. However, there is indeed no general agreement on defining and articulating the term Trito-Isaiah, except to position most texts within the post-exilic time. Was it a book-form or a collection of several individual texts? Is ‘Trito-Isaiah’ a hypothetical name of an anonymous prophet who wrote a book or a prophetic scribal group? Does this have direct or indirect affinities with previous traditions or not? Was the writer(s) responsible for the composition of the final-form Isaiah? How much did he/they engage in this process? What was the *Sitz im Leben* of it? All questions are still on the table within the Isaianic

²⁶⁰ Schüle, “Isaiah 56-66,” 139.

²⁶¹ Schüle, “Isaiah 56-66,” 130.

²⁶² Moon Kwon Chae, *The Radical Idea of the Priesthood of Foreigners: Understanding the Inclusivism in Isaiah 56:1-8* (PhD diss., Baylor University, 2021), 136.

scholarship. Interestingly, depending on how scholars decide to place texts in history, the gap between the earlier text and the later one would be from fifty years to two hundred. It implies the plurality of the readings in Trito-Isaiah. Here I will use the term Trito-Isaiah to refer to the literary unit of chs. 56-66 and its anonymous speaker/writer in the postexilic circumstances within Persian Yehud.

Some scholars introduced above prefer the Trito-Isaian collection, it is hard to deal with chs. 56-66 as a self-contained, coherent, literary book-form because of the issues around the thematic incoherency. That is why this incoherency usually has been considered to be the mark of compositional hands, which belong in different historical settings. A good example is found between core and booklets. While chs. 61-62 contain the monologic self-proclaimed message to his inner group by an anonymous speaker/writer, the booklets like 56:1-8 and 66:1-24 expand its audience to external groups by using typical prophetic messenger speech form. For this reason, the first is considered an earlier version, with more affinity with the Deutero-Isainic tradition than the last. Even though we accept this general historic picture of the booklets as later than the core, it is still silent on why the incoherent messages co-exist within the present form of Trito-Isaiah. If we put this theological discrepancy into terms dealing with the socio-psychological realms, instead of only historical realms, this provides an understanding of how one changes ideas throughout his or her own embodied and cultural experiences.

In this vein, I will define Trito-Isaiah as the finalized book-form which contains ambivalent concepts about the anonymous prophet who belong in the late sixth century B.C.E. Persian Yehud. I agree that the proposal of P. A. Smith that the formation of Trito-Isaiah did not

occur over one generation. However, this compositional process is not performed by various agents but by one who belongs in a particular interpretive community, who are refugees returned from Babylonia. He reuses the traditional rhetoric to achieve certain political goals with biconceptuals to prove himself to his inner community and to expand his audiences to his outer community. Since he depends on previous collective memories like Isaianic traditions and rhetoric, it is difficult to identify him as a creative author rather than a lively active reader with particular socio-cultural frames. We can say that the identity of this reader is implied from his experience of reading texts, but the mechanism of reading is somehow implied and somehow creative.

As Stromberg points out, the compositional stage of the final form of Trito-Isaiah would overlap with that of the final form of the Book of Isaiah. However, this thesis limits its interests to investigating why the final form of the Trito-Isaiah contains contradictory messages of the anonymous speaker/writer.

Chapter Three

Methodology for Reading Biconceptuals in Trito-Isaiah

Interaction with the past in the literati's reality is very important in the effort to reconstruct how Trito-Isaiah builds his rhetoric for persuading its audiences. The postexilic returnees are identified as the elite literati who “supported the claims of these texts to reflect YHWH’s interactions with Israel in the past, and as such helped to create a memory of that Israel.”¹ The author of Trito-Isaiah was one who belonged to such a community and interacted with the past and the present by (dis)remembering. The theories on collective memory and interpretive communities provide important insights into how Trito-Isaiah was rereading the previous Isaian tradition within his socio-cultural interpretive community during the late sixth century B.C.E. How do readers (dis)remember the past from the present? What are problems when the present appropriates the past in certain ways? How do readers re-read the given texts transmitted from the past within interpretive communities? What are the roles of interpretive communities in terms of rereading and reception? How do readers use his metaphorical concepts in relation to his embodied and cultural experiences? Those questions will reveal that the process

¹ Ehud Ben Zvi, “Introduction—Setting an Agenda,” in *Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Michael H. Floyd (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 13. As Walter J. Ong points out, the crucial turning point from oral traditions to written texts is the development of the writing system, but this issue is not covered in this thesis. Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (New York: Routledge, 1982). William M. Schniedewind and Christopher A. Rollston both focus on how literacy had evolved with the development of the writing system in terms of ancient Hebrew. William M. Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Christopher A. Rollston, *Writing and Literacy in the World of Ancient Israel: Epigraphic Evidence from the Iron Age* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010); See also JiSeong James Kwon, *Scribal Culture and Intertextuality: Literary and Historical Relationships Between Job and Deutero-Isaiah* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

of rereading the past in the present is experimental, not normative. Therefore, our purpose of reading Trito-Isaiah should not be confined to a simple quest for the complete logical ideas of anonymous postexilic writer(s) and its communities. Instead, it is necessary to admit that an ancient writer would have biconceptuals in his embodied and cultural experiences, since even he was surrounded by various frames in the complicated contexts of Persian Yehud. This chapter will construct theoretical foundations for reading Trito-Isaiah while taking into account these ambivalences.

3.1. Collective Memory

The author(s)/redactor(s) of Trito-Isaiah were the re-readers of the previous Isaianic traditions with respect to intertextual or inner-biblical reproduction of meanings. Whether or not the author was singular or plural, whether or not this author was coming from the Isaianic circle/discipleship, it would be said that this author shares a sense of collective memory, which was reiterated in what is inherent in the mindset of the returnees, who immigrated from Babylonia at the end of the exilic period.

The concept of collective memory provides a key to explain inner-biblical and intertextual processes in relation to form and redaction criticism. When we apply this concept to the case of biblical texts, the problem becomes complicated. If we accept the long historical formulation of the present text from oral to written, we notice that there are diverse forms, genres, and structures found, whether each is situated in earlier or later stages, in relation to its socio-cultural setting. In other words, the present form of biblical texts had been formulated

through the long inner-biblical and intertextual process of re-reading the previous traditions and reproducing meanings whether or not they come from oral or written messages. In this respect, it is right to see biblical texts as ideological drama (Sternberg) and history of consequences (Seow) to highlight their interpretive characteristics. This means that biblical texts should be composed throughout the process of (dis)remembering and representing the past from the present perspective that is shared by the particular community.

Collective memory is related to the socio-cultural aspects of how something is remembered. According to Maurice Halbwachs, except in the case of dreams on an unconscious level,² most memories are be interrelated within social frameworks that encompass individuals who are living in a society.³ In other words, collective memory is crystallized and transmitted through relationships within family, religious, occupational, and other groups, which Halbwachs refers to as social classes.⁴ Thus, the activity of groups assists in the formation of group identity and consciousness. In this respect, individuals' memories, except in the case of dreams, are dependent upon social memory.

We can understand each memory as it occurs in individual thought only if we locate each within the thought of the corresponding group. We cannot properly understand their

² Jan Assmann rightly points out that Halbwachs' concept of collective memory should not be equivalent with Jung's collective unconsciousness. He said, "One should not confuse the concept of the collective with theories of a collective uncon-scious, along the lines of Jungian archetypes, because this is the complete opposite of Halbwachs's theory. For Jung the collective memory was 1) biologically hereditary, and 2) a *me'moire involontaire* that, for instance, expressed itself in dreams. Halbwachs was concerned only with what was communicable, not with what was heritable, and with the *me'moire volontaire*." Jan Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 33.

³ Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*. trans. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 46-53. Originally published in French, 1925.

⁴ It is not the Marxist concept of class. Halbwachs focuses on the transition from nobility to bourgeoisie under the ancient regime.

relative strength and the ways in which they combine within individual thought unless we connect the individual to the various groups of which he is simultaneously a member.⁵

The process of framing (through the selection and construction of social memory) shaped by a certain agency or location means that some memories will be dismissed and disremembered by the community. From the form-critical point of view, we can think of *Sitz im Leben* as being like Gunkel's campfire where the folklore was transmitted and Mowinckel's temple where the ritual was performed as indicating the social locations that ensured the formation of group memory. As Jan Assmann points out, Halbwachs was more interested in the cultural aspect of collective memory presented in his later work *Legendary Topography of the Gospels in the Holy Land* (1941).⁶

Assmann's insights go even further than Halbwachs. He is more focused on the cultural and archival aspect of collective memory than was Halbwachs's sociological analysis.⁷ Borrowed from Lutz Niethammer, Assmann put Halbwachs's concept as the communicative memory in the field of oral history.⁸ At this point, Halbwachs's concept has been downgraded to a lower level of collective memory.

For us the concept of "communicative memory" includes those varieties of collective memory that are based exclusively on everyday communications. These varieties, which M. Halbwachs gathered and analyzed under the concept of collective memory, constitute the field of oral history. Everyday communication is characterized by a high degree of non-specialization, reciprocity of roles, thematic instability, and disorganization. Typically, it takes place between partners who can change roles.⁹

⁵ Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 53.

⁶ Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 193-235. Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 32.

⁷ Although he is an archeologist and Egyptologist, his approach is easier to see as it is (emic) instead of reconstructing what happened in the past from an etic perspective.

⁸ Lutz Niethammer, "Oral History as a Channel of Communication between Workers and Historians (1982)" in *Memory and History: Essays in Contemporary History*. (New York: Routledge, 2012) , 63-76.

⁹ Jan Assmann, "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity," *New German Critique*. 65 (1995), 126.

Unlike Halbwachs, who is more interested in the collective memory formation that occurs within the group and occupational setting, Assmann is more focused on the everyday communicative function from generation to generation. He even limits the communicative memory to no more than three or four generations (eighty to one hundred years).¹⁰ In his 2011 work, Assmann more precisely elaborates his model, then calls it a biographical mode of memory concerning “personal experiences and their framework - that is, the recent past.”¹¹ Then, what is the upper level of collective memory in Assmann’s concept? Assmann suggests cultural memory, the foundational mode of memory, which is a matter of origins, construction, and institutional mnemotechnics.¹² The cultural memory takes a more fixed, stable, formal mode of state than does the communicative memory. In this respect, it represents the forms of mystic narrative, cultic rituals, ceremonies, festivals, commemorations, and monuments that shape the identity of the remembering group. This means that cultural memory requires specialists like priests, scribes and teachers who will convey this knowledge to participants. While participating in this kind of cultural memory in a controlled setting, other kinds of memory are excluded.¹³ Assmann’s model of cultural memory is plausible but his application of cultural memory to the monotheism of ancient Egypt and Israel has many defects because of his constructive

¹⁰ Assmann, “Collective Memory,” 127.

¹¹ Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 37.

¹² Assmann evaluates Halbwachs’s understanding of memory and tradition as one that is analogous with Assmann’s two modes of biographical/communicative and foundational/cultural. Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 48-50. However, Assmann’s analysis of Halbwachs is somewhat arbitrary.

¹³ Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 39-40.

understanding of historiography.¹⁴ Barry Schwartz is one of the critics of this kind of constructional, deterministic, and archival (and even minimalistic) approach as a way to deal with the past as “a fabrication that present circumstances shape.”¹⁵ Therefore, continuity between the past and the present is a very important matter for Schwartz’s view: “if human memory were typically a creation, it would have no survival value, and we would possess no contact with the past.”¹⁶ In the process of collective memory formation, the actual past also affects and “shapes our understanding of the present.”¹⁷

No successful historical writer, however, is free to create any conversation he or she likes; the writer must construct talk that readers find plausibly motivated, consistent with the subject’s actions, and hence objectively possible....As these memories were passed on, they were modified, but the essence of the events to which they refer remained unchanged. This essence, and the ways and reasons it is maintained, are the principal subjects of my research into social memory.¹⁸

¹⁴ In line with Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalytic analysis on Moses as a follower of Akhenaten in his later work *Moses and Monotheism* (1939), Assmann expands it through cultural memory theory. Instead of digging into Moses in the biblical texts and Jewish culture, he was more interested in Moses who has been remembered in western culture. His hypothetical reconstruction is that Moses the Egyptian who was serving for the Akhenaten monotheism is not identified with biblical Moses. Since biblical Moses was receiving the Torah at Sinai, the monotheistic distinction between true and false began. Assmann problematized that this distinction should be abolished to overcome religious crisis and tension. Jan Assmann, “The Mosaic Distinction: Israel, Egypt, and the Invention of Paganism” in *Representations* 56 (1996), 48-67; See also, Jan Assmann, *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism* (Harvard University Press, 1998). Later, after facing lots of criticism, he withdrew his use of the “Mosaic distinction between true and false” to the problem of right and wrong: “The distinction as such, and as a defining feature of monotheism, still seems to me irrefutable, but I would no longer call it “mosaic.”...In its aspect of law, the torah is not about true and false, but about right and wrong” Assmann, “Exodus and Memory” in *Afterlife of Events: Perspectives on Mnemohistory*. ed. Marek Tamm (Heidelberg: Springer, 2015), 115-133.

¹⁵ Barry Schwartz, “Social Change and Collective Memory: The Democratization of George Washington” in *ASR* 56 (1991), 221-26 (222).

¹⁶ Barry Schwartz, “Where There's Smoke, There's Fire: Memory and History.” in *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz*. Semeia 78. ed. Tom Thatcher (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 21.

¹⁷ Schwartz, “Social Change,” 222.

¹⁸ Schwartz, “Where There's Smoke,” 9.

All kinds of memory (re)shaping would be dependent on the past. As Dennis C. Duling summarizes it in one sentence, “Social change *affects* social memory, but it does not *determine* it.” (emphasis his)¹⁹ So, Schwartz defines collective memory as “neither a collection of individual ideas nor some ‘mysterious group memory’,” but “an emergent social fact which remains as individuals replace one another.”²⁰ In this respect, Olick’s theory of path-dependent memory is grounded in this line of thought of the continuity between the past and the present. By using Bakhtin’s dialogical understanding of genre, he suggests that how Bakhtinian “understanding of genre highlights commemoration’s role in producing its own circumstances, for earlier commemorations shape later ways of seeing, whether or not subsequent speakers are aware of any specific earlier commemoration.”²¹ While Schwartz is more focused on how the past shapes the present, here Olick is going further to highlight how the present genre of commemoration is path-dependent on the patterned forms and genre of earlier commemorations throughout the ongoing dialogue between the past and the present. He continues,

Changes in historical images, however, are not just onetime interactions between the meanings of the distant past and the needs of the present. Rather, from the moment being remembered, present images are constantly being reproduced, revised, and replaced. Many authors therefore trace the history of representations of the past over time. In doing so, however, we must not treat these histories as successions of discrete moments, one

¹⁹ Dennis C. Duling, “Social Memory and Commemoration of the Death of “the Lord”: Paul’s Response to the Lord’s Supper Factions at Corinth” in *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz*. Semeia 78 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 297.

²⁰ Barry Schwartz, “Collective Memory” in the *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology* (Wiley and Sons, 2017) (Online). The difference between individualistic and collectivistic idea on the collective memory is well discussed by Jeffrey K. Olick. He divides memory into two parts: the collected memory and the collective memory. While the first is about aggregation and collections of socially framed individual memories, the latter refers to “collective phenomena sui generis” that shares the socio-cultural consciousness and framework. Jeffrey K. Olick, “Collective Memory: The Two Cultures” in *Sociological Theory* 17.3. (1999), 333-348.

²¹ Jeffrey K. Olick, “Genre Memories and Memory Genres: A Dialogical Analysis of May 8, 1945 Commemorations in the Federal Republic of Germany” in *ASR* 64 (1999) 383.

present-to-past relation after another; images of the past depend not only on the relationship between past and present but also on the accumulation of previous such relationships and their ongoing constitution and reconstitution.²²

At this point, it should be noted that memory here differs from history, especially the Rankean concept of history²³ as being objective, scientific, universal, and sometimes artificial.²⁴ In general, while history refers to the critical and academic endeavor to construct what happened in the past, memory is related to how individuals and communities are responding and representing their past experiences.²⁵ Pierre Nora even goes further, claiming that history is “perpetually suspicious of memory, and its true mission is to suppress and destroy it” to sound the alarm of social amnesia or disremembrance of the public narrative.²⁶ Although Nora aggressively describes memory as a contradictory and conflicting term of history, he does not mean that memory does not have history and also does not mean that each necessarily plays a complementary role. As Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy tell us, memory is “the basic form of our relationship to the past, of our existence in time” but the relationship of both is changed depending on which media vehicles are used.²⁷ In fact, Nora’s

²² Olick, “Genre Memories,” 382.

²³ Barry Schwartz sees von Ranke as an essentialist: “Leopold von Ranke was a romantic idealist who never believed the historian’s task to be the mere collection of facts. His use of the German adverb *eigentlich*, generally understood by English-language historians to mean “actually,” is more accurately translated “essentially”—a term that takes us beneath surface facts.” in his “Where There’s Smoke, There’s Fire,” 20. (footnote 4).

²⁴ It is true that postmodern and postcolonial redefinition of history would be connected with memory studies since history is considered as interpretation, not science.

²⁵ Wertscher provides a quite simple summarized table to compare collective memory and analytic history. See, James V. Wertsch, “Collective memory” in *Memory in Mind and Culture*. ed. P. Boyer et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 127.

²⁶ Pierre Nora, “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire” in *Representations* 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory (Spring, 1989), 8-9.

²⁷ Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, “Introduction” in *The Collective Memory Reader* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 10; Barry Schwartz is also very critical that Nora is exaggerating to

actual fear of social ignorance has to do with the decomposition of memory-history and the multiplication of private memory within the individualistic culture.²⁸ He continues,

The atomization of a general memory into a private one has given the obligation to remember a power of internal coercion. It gives everyone the necessity to remember and to protect the trappings of identity; when memory is no longer everywhere, it will not be anywhere unless one takes the responsibility to recapture it through individual means. The less memory is experienced collectively, the more it will retire individuals to undertake to become themselves memory-individuals...”

That is why Nora’s projects of *Les Lieux de Mémoire* (sites of memory) are designed to show how those who shared one communal identity remember, monumentalize, commemorate, and ritualize past events that are shaped by a socially constructed framework in the present public space and time by the use of mnemonic devices.

In the case of ancient times, there was no modern type of nation-state, but it does not mean that there was no ancient collective memory that served monarchs with certain teleological goals. The DtrH is a clear example of this type of historiography that served the Davidic royal propaganda based on the covenantal relationship with YHWH. Torah and Temple were the primary sites of memory for shaping the national identity of the Jews before and after the fall of Jerusalem. David M. Carr’s example of the process of the standardization of scripture during the Hellenistic period would be also a good example of sites of memory. Facing the challenges of the hellenization program inflamed by Antiochus IV Euphron, Jews were trying to revive their national identity. He said,

differentiate history and collective memory and undermining its interdependence. in his “Where There's Smoke,” 17.

²⁸ Nora, “Between Memory and History,” 11, 15.

It is precisely amidst such rapid change that societies are most prone to focus on their ancient traditions—orienting themselves around newly dear “mother tongues,” sacred sites of pilgrimage, commemorative festivals, and the like. In each case, older traditions are appropriated to new ends by later societies in transition. A particular older dialect is selected to be the holy “mother tongue.” A given site with older associations is given a specific meaning in national mythology. A festival previously of marginal significance is transformed into a major holiday. Such festivals, sites, and languages then provide secure, ancient anchor points for societies undergoing rapid and disorienting transformations.²⁹

Even though the biblical examples above are limited in the cases of remembrance and forgetting at the national level, every site of memory would not be confined to this category. That is why Ben Zvi redefines Nora’s concept, moving it to the social-anthropological level: “most of these sites (of memory) act as ciphers to be activated within a particular social discourse, and as places to be visited and revisited, even if only mentally, as part of a self-supportive mechanism of socialization and social reproduction.”³⁰ In this respect, Ben Zvi’s analysis of memory is more dependent upon Eviatar Zerubavel’s theory of cognitive sociology and others like Barry Schwartz and James V. Wertsch than upon Assmann’s cultural memory.³¹

Nora strongly emphasizes the nationalistic and nostalgic modes of collective memory. However, he does not give much warning against the propagandistic misuse of the collective memory by the nation-state, as we learned during the World Wars. As Aledia Assmann points out, the collective memory of each of the nation-states is very different depending on how it has been created—whether from a heroic and self-celebrating mode or from a tragic mode of trauma,

²⁹ David M. Carr, *Holy Resilience: The Bible’s Traumatic Origins* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 153.

³⁰ Ehud Ben Zvi, “The Study of Forgetting and the Forgotten in Ancient Israelite Discourse/s: Observations and Test Cases” in *Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis*. ed. Niels Peter Lemche et al. (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012), 139-158.

³¹ Ehud Ben Zvi, “Reshaping the Memory of Zedekiah and His Period in Chronicles” in *Congress Volume Munich 2013*. VTSup 163. ed. Christl M. Maier (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 371. (footnote 2)

victimhood, and suffering.³² Shoah/Holocaust and post-colonial national memories are included in the latter mode. The biblical example of collective memory of victimhood and trauma would be recorded both as prophetic laments (Kathleen O'Connor) and exilic experiences (Daniel Smith-Christopher).³³ Conversely, collective memory actually appears in the form of collective disremembrance. Carr shows how the exilic people deal with Abraham and Sarah's narrative as a form of screen memory to hide their present condition: "Caught in collective amnesia about their exilic present and past, these Judeans in Babylon focused instead on stories of ancient ancestors. They 'looked to' landless ancestors like Abraham and Sarah, related to their struggles, and found hope in their promise."³⁴

Then, the collective memory of trauma and victimhood becomes an important vehicle for dealing with how to remember the past and transmit it to the next generation. Marianne Hirsh's concept of post-memory deals with how the second and third generation of Shoah-survivors

³² Aleida Assmann, "Cultural Memory" in *Social Trauma: An Interdisciplinary Textbook*. ed. Andreas Hamburger et al. (Heidelberg: Springer, 2020), 26.

³³ Kathleen M. O'Connor, *Lamentations and the Tears of the World* (New York: Orbis Books, 2002); *Jeremiah: Pain and Promise* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2011); "Stammering Toward the Unsayable: Old Testament Theology, Trauma Theory, and Genesis" in *Interpretation* 70.3 (2016) 301-313; Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, "Reading War and Trauma: Suggestions toward a Social-Psychological Exegesis of Exile and War in Biblical Texts" in *Interpreting Exile: Displacement and Deportation in Biblical and Modern Contexts*. ed. Brad E. Kelle et al. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2011), 253-274; "Trauma and the Old Testament: Some Problems and Prospects" in *Trauma and Traumatization in Individual and Collective Dimensions: Insights from Biblical Studies and Beyond*. ed. E. E. Becker et al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2014), 222-242; Fine introduction on current research, David G. Garber Jr. "Trauma Theory and Biblical Studies" *CBR* 14.1. (2015) 24-44; Scott P. Bayer's recent study deals with Micah 1-3 using Jeffrey Alexander's cultural trauma theory. Scott P. Bayer, *We All Know What Happened to Micah: Micah and Trauma Theory* (PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2021).

³⁴ David M. Carr, *Holy Resilience: The Bible's Traumatic Origins* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014) 96. The term collective amnesia is used with 'silent collective memory.' see, 266, 302. As Miroslav Volf points out, in his theological reflection of the Yugoslav Wars, forgetting would be required for those who are suffering from the traumatic events. Miroslav Volf, *The End of Memory: Remembering Rightly in a Violent World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006), 152-76.

project what the parents experienced. She defined it as “the relationship that the ‘generation after’ bears to the personal, collective, and cultural trauma of those who came before – and to the experiences they ‘remember’ only by means of the stories, images, and behaviors with which they grew up.”³⁵ In this vein, Hirsh focuses on writing and visual recollections (esp. photographic images) to connect and remember the past. Picturesque descriptions of past traumatic events are found within biblical writings which were formed after the mass catastrophic events in Jerusalem such as those that occurred during 587/6 and 168/7 BCE as mentioned above. Reading Lamentations in Tisha B’Av (*Ta’anit* 30a), the Jewish holiday observed on the ninth day of Av (in late July or early August in the Gregorian calendar), shows how to link past memories to present generations. By doing that, today Jews can connect not only to the destruction of the First Temple but also they are reminded of other similar traumatic events that happened in different timeframes and spaces.³⁶ The case of Tisha B’Av is a clear example that the collective memory is not limited to a particular time or space or by any means of transmission. This transgenerational trait of collective memory, which contains trauma, raises three questions in terms of 1) psychoanalytical and psychological points of view on the collective projection; 2) risk of appropriation in the historical reality; and 3) competitiveness with other collective memories.

First, how do we evaluate the projection of the present generations onto the past traumatic memory? It is true that Hirsh’s use of projection is not about developmental

³⁵ Marianne Hirsh, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 5. See also, Marianne Hirsh, “Presidential Address 2014: Connective Histories in Vulnerable Times” in *PMLA* 129.4 (2014), 330-348.

³⁶ Sweeney, *TANAK*, 433.

psychology and psychoanalysis; instead it is intended to emphasize the strength of the connection of the pictured images to the present and the past.³⁷ The traditional psychoanalytical view of projection is that it is one of the defense mechanisms identified in the Freudian theory which is based on the unconscious sexual desires that develop in a child's mind through the dynamics between child and parents. Instead of holding a one-generational model, Sue Grand and Jill Salberg go beyond to discuss the transgenerational transmission that happens when the attachment relationship is ruptured by destructive and dehumanizing trauma while survivors hold ambivalent feelings that range from resiliency to scars. These dual aspects are also transmitted to successive generations.³⁸ At this point, Grand and Salberg are focusing on how to change our action from the transmission of wounds to the transmission of strength to improve social functioning.

The transmission of strength, resourcefulness, and resilience that operates in tandem with the transmission of wounds is widely missing from trans-generational literature. There is a dual edge of history's legacy: the ways it can take shape in an ethos of *care*, as well as in varieties of (self/other) destruction. Besides the disintegrative effects of trauma on attachment bonding, we also can find the miracle of *enduring attachment* that is also threaded through encounters with trauma. This familial unconscious is shaped through stories and relational patterning, by both resiliency *and* wounds.³⁹

In other words, the collective (traumatic) memory, especially of the family group, has been transmitted by the transgenerational attachment on the unconscious level, not just conscious

³⁷ Hirsh, *The Generation of Postmemory*, 159.

³⁸ Sue Grand and Jill Salberg, "Trans-Generational Transmission of Trauma" in *Social Trauma: An Interdisciplinary Textbook*, ed. Andreas Hamburger, et al. (Heidelberg: Springer, 2020), 211-12. See also, Sue Grand and Jill Salberg, "Editors' Introduction" in *The Wounds of History: Repair and Resilience in the Transgenerational Transmission of Trauma*. (New York: Routledge, 2017), 1-6. Jill Sallberg, "The Texture of Traumatic Attachment: Presence and Ghostly Absence in Transgenerational Transmission," 77-99.

³⁹ Grand and Salberg, "Trans-Generational Transmission of Trauma," 213.

the social dimension. The rediscovery of the unconscious side of collective memory is very important since Halbwachs limits its presence within the area of individuals' dreams. In this respect, Grand and Salberg call on us to give more attention to the alienated, objectified other, while the earlier Halbwachs model fails to focus on interactions with siblings and multiple generations and the impact of collective trauma on a social, cultural, and ethical basis.⁴⁰

Second, is there a danger of appropriation of the past event to the present, as an interviewer of the Columbia University Press is asking Hirsh, is there something like "trauma envy" that motivates "descendants of survivors" to call "attention to themselves, rather than simply telling the story of those who have been persecuted and have suffered in the past."⁴¹ Definitely, there is no such thing in her work since she is dealing with the case of those who share Shoah memory within the family setting. However, if this memory is expanded into the larger public sphere, the dynamics and discourses of the collective memory become complicated. Zygmunt Bauman has pointed out that the survivor's feelings of moral guilt about the past tragic event has faded and the narrative has been simplified into the logic of the survivalist, such as 'he who strikes first, survives' or 'the stronger lives.'⁴² Then he is paying attention to how the survivor's trauma and guilt become official symptoms as can be seen in the Holocaust syndrome. That guilt is then appropriated by others, even those who are not directly connected with the tragic Shoah memory. At that point, "the ghost has been issued with the official permission of domicile, recognised as the lawful plenipotentiary of the 'real thing', and so (in tune with the

⁴⁰ Grand and Salberg, "Trans-Generational Transmission of Trauma," 211.

⁴¹ <https://cup.columbia.edu/author-interviews/hirsch-generation-postmemory>

⁴² Zygmunt Bauman, "The Holocaust's Life as a Ghost," in *Social Theory after the Holocaust*, ed. Robert Fine and Charles Turner (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), 8-9. It was originally published as "Hereditary Victimhood: The Holocaust's Life as a Ghost," *Tikkun* 13.4 (1998), 33-38.

spirit of our time) the troublesome and worrying distinction between the ‘real’ and ‘virtual’ reality has been declared null and void.”⁴³ This status of ethical indulgence makes them continue to find the accused, assumed victimizers.

Thus the status of hereditary victim may take the moral reprobation off the new victimisation – this time perpetrated in the name of erasing the hereditary stigma. We often say that violence breeds more violence; we remind ourselves much too rarely, though, that victimisation breeds more victimisation. Victims are not guaranteed to be morally superior to their victimisers, and seldom emerge from the victimisation morally ennobled. Martyrdom – whether lived in a real or a virtual reality – is not a warrant for saintliness... The pernicious legacy of the Holocaust is that today’s persecutors may inflict new pains and create new generations of victims eagerly awaiting their chance to do the same, while acting in the belief that they avenge yesterday’s pain and ward off the pains of tomorrow; while being convinced, in other words, that ethics is on their side. This is perhaps the most awesome among the Holocaust’s curses and the greatest of Hitler’s posthumous victories.⁴⁴

At this point, he calls to exorcise the ghost from one who is being possessed and having a one-dimensional prejudice against the others in the vision of their haters, what Bauman calls ‘a haunted house.’⁴⁵ In other words, it is necessary to pay attention to the risky appropriation of the collective memory by its mislink with certain projections or prejudices. This is the way for practicing Emil Fackenheim’s 614th commandment while perceiving the presence of the others.⁴⁶ Jie-Hyun Lim develops Bauman's concept into the East-Asian and even transnational context. His model of victimhood nationalism is designed for explaining “to competing national memories for the position of collective victims” who are hereditarily holding the past within the

⁴³ Bauman, “The Holocaust’s Life as a Ghost,” 11.

⁴⁴ Bauman, “The Holocaust’s Life as a Ghost,” 12-13.

⁴⁵ Bauman, “The Holocaust’s Life as a Ghost,” 15-17.

⁴⁶ Emil Fackenheim, “The 614th Commandment.” in *Judaism* 16 (1967), 269–73.

historical imagination which is framed by the nation state.⁴⁷ While Bauman problematizes the ignorance of the other, Lim more focuses on how the individual victimizer who has committed these crimes is transformed into one of the collective victims within the historically framed (sacralized, nationalized) memory.

By nature, such a collective memory cannot be sacralized; rather it is an arena of political contestation. In reality, however, memories have been sacralized especially in discourses of victimhood nationalism. By not allowing outsiders any chance to understand ‘our own unique past’, sacralized memories keep a monopoly on understanding the past. In this unique past, nationalists can find a mental enclave where they can enjoy a morally comfortable position, very often disregarding the fact that these heirs of historical victimhood have become today’s perpetrators.⁴⁸

One of his examples reveals how the emigrants manifested this hereditary nationalism in the transnational setting. When Yoko Kawashima Watkins’ autobiographical novella of *So Far from the Booboo Grove* listed in the American school curriculum, Korean-Americans became fired-up over this decision in 2007 because it dismissed the Korean’s collective memory of victimhood during World War II. However, this book did not get much attention from the Korean media and readers when it was translated into Korean in 2005. As Lim pointed out, those emigrants (from the perspective of Lim) were neglecting individual suffering and exaggerating their collective memory of victimhood by holding to the “hegemonic ethnic nationalism of Korea, while Korea itself has come to be a multinational and multicultural country long after their emigration. The role of ethnocentrism in the emigrants’ long-distance nationalism is clearly

⁴⁷ Jie-Hyun Lim, “Victimhood Nationalism in Contested Memories: National Mourning and Global Accountability,” in *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, ed. Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 139.

⁴⁸ Lim, “Victimhood Nationalism,” 140.

stronger than its role in nationalism in Korea.”⁴⁹ Bauman and Lim’s analysis of the hereditary nationalism within the immigration setting gives a key to understanding how the exiled migrants consolidate their view on the past trauma in 587/6 and metamorphosize the enthusiastic vision of restoration from the theological reflection of the past as a form of divine punishment. While those who remained in Judah were beginning to coexist with non-Jews in the aftermath of the fall of the monarchy, at the periphery of the Babylonian Empire those who were exiled and their generations continued to cling to the nationalistic hope of restoration at the center. The problem is that, when the latter arrived in their homeland, where the former were living, their nationalistic enthusiasm faced the complexity of reality within the postexilic space of Yehud. This will be discussed in greater depth in the next chapter.

The third question is: If collective memories compete with each other in transnational reality, as Lim describes them, how do we communicate with the other’s collective memory with a sense of responsibility? Do we need to hold the competitive model that leads us to a zero-sum game over limited numbers of pieces in the pizza? If one collective memory takes universality on a global level, is it okay to say that this memory is more valuable to remember than the others? On the problem of the others and the plurality of the collective memory, Michael Rothberg goes beyond Bauman and Lim’s perspectives. His theory of multidirectional memory is designed for answering these questions. He is very critical of those who are holding a one-directional understanding with a competitive model whether one defends or criticizes the uniqueness of memory. In this respect, Rothberg’s theory does not deny the uniqueness of the globalized

⁴⁹ Lim, “Victimhood Nationalism,” 144.

collective memory, for example like memories of the Holocaust within postwar circumstances. But his theory is about warning of monopoly and the exclusion of the unique discourse by holding to the idea of a typical dichotomy between collective guilt and innocence.⁵⁰ Instead he focuses on moving forward from the Freudian psychoanalytic and individualistic understanding of memory as Grand and Salberg do and following Avishai Margalit's concept of shared memory.⁵¹ So, Rothberg uses the positive power of the multidirectional memory to bind different collective memories together by overlapping and echoing throughout the process of communication by mnemonic devices and its effects.⁵² In this respect, he calls for a comparative and ethical reconsideration of the dominant archives and sites, what Assmanns and Nora consider to be the crucial memory carrier of cultural or national memory.⁵³ Although he sees how each different collective memory bonds together and holds a non-competitive mode of solidarity, it is still somewhat idealistic because of the competitive nature of political reality. As we can see in the decade of the 2010s, a series of backlashes by neo-nationalists and populists against the transnational and cosmopolitan collective memory all over the world. Facing these antagonistic backlashes, Chantal Mouffe proposes the agonistic approach to the pluralistic context to overcome binary understanding.

What I mean by "agonism" is a relationship of "adversaries." Contrary to the antagonistic friend/enemy relation in which there is no shared symbolic terrain and in which the different sides aim at eliminating their opponent, in an agonistic relation the adversaries share a common symbolic space and they recognize, at least to some degree, the

⁵⁰ Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford University Press, 2009), 9, 17.

⁵¹ Avishai Margalit's 'shared memory' is contrasted with his 'common memory'. This is similar with Olick's division of 'collected memory' and 'collective memory'.

⁵² Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory*, 15-17.

⁵³ Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory*, 18.

legitimacy of the claims of their opponents. A sort of "conflictual consensus" exists between the various groups. They agree about the ethical principles which should inform their political association, but they disagree about their interpretation.⁵⁴

In other words, unlike Rothberg, she is admitting the competitiveness in the political reality; then calls attention to how all parties share the rules and principles of the game. In this vein, Anna Cento Bull and Hans Lauge Hansen (2015) discuss agonistic memory as the third option as a reflective and dialogic mode of collective memory in the plural reality, for overcoming the protagonistic/antagonistic binary.⁵⁵

We examined how modern scholars define collective memory in terms of the remembrance and forgetting of the past from the perspective of the present. It is true that whether or not any group or entity is bearing and carrying the collective memory in certain ways, the important thing is that the collective memory is path-dependent on the dialogic dynamics between the past and the present. Borrowing from Hans-Georg Gadamer, collective memory brings about "fusion of horizons (*Horizontverschmelzung*).” However, as Bauman and Lim point out, the problem is raised when the present generation appropriates and monopolizes the past by excluding direct connection with any others. Rothberg’s non-competitive model of multi-directional memory would be a good model for it, but it is too idealistic within the plural reality. Instead, the agonistic model, following Mouffe’s idea, provides an alternative that allows respect for each other within all-agreed rules and principles by overcoming binarism.

⁵⁴ Chantal Mouffe, "An Agonistic Approach to the Future of Europe," in *New Literary History*. 43.4 (2012), 632-3.

⁵⁵ Anna Cento Bull and Hans Lauge Hansen, "On Agonistic Memory" in *Memory Studies* 9.4. (2015), 390-404.

3.2. Interpretive Communities

The collective memory is not only a contemporary phenomenon, as the earlier response of Shoah and the colonial experience make clear. As we briefly discussed, biblical texts contain the long transmitted collective memory from generation to generation. More specifically, in terms of form-critical restating, each typical genre (such as historiographies, historical narratives, historical poems, prophetic oracles of judgment or restoration, individual or communal laments) reveals unique forms by which the present generation remembers and re-reads the past within a certain socio-cultural context. In other words, those concerns of collective memory in the biblical studies are deeply related to and have long been discussed by ancient author(s) and/or redactor(s) of *Sitz im Leben* and *Sitz in der Literatur* in relation to oral tradition and scribal redaction. As we discussed in previous chapters, the view on the role of those who were responsible for the formation of biblical literature had shifted from passive to active interpretive roles by those who formed the texts that contain collective memory with particular contextual perspectives in certain times and spaces. In other words, these ancient author(s) or redactor(s) were reader(s) who learned about who they are and what they believe from their forebears in family, community, circle, school, court, or temple. We no longer hold the idea that Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah had a direct connection with Isaian discipleship because of the lack of textual evidences. However, we can still infer that such a connection would affect each document in some sense because we can observe the intertextual dynamics between them diachronically and synchronically within the final form. This dynamic functions as a kind of theological or hermeneutical framework to rule over text and as well as its read, whether or not that is intended.

The issue around thematic unity within the later final form structure has been thoroughly discussed by the above-mentioned scholars in Chapter Two. The problem here addressed is how and why Trito-Isaiah stands in between unity and disunity within this standard framework. Before we go into this issue, this section will discuss issues around reader-response, especially responses of Wolfgang Iser and Stanley Fish. Then, we will briefly review scribal cultures with those models.

The reader-response criticism came to the scholarship as a critical reaction against the text-centered approaches. While new critics were too much focused on close reading to see linguistic, structural, formalistic, stylistic, and rhetorical aspects of the text itself, the role of the reader is too limited and easily dismissed under the rules of logocentric idealism and textual determinism. In this respect, reader-response criticism calls attention to the reader's active role during the reading process in terms of meaning production. Lois Tyson divides this method into five categories: 1) transactional reader-response theory; 2) affective stylistics; 3) subjective reader-response theory; 4) psychological reader-response theory; and 5) social reader-response theory.⁵⁶ The first one highlights the transactional and interactive dynamics between the text and the reader. Wolfgang Iser and Louise M. Rosenblatt are major contributors of this theory. The second category was issued by Stanley Fish early in his time (1970). He emphasized the interpretive independence of the reader from the text while he rejected the affective fallacy that was raised by such new critics as the strong believers of the textual objectivity of Wimsatt and Beardsley, who were worried about falsely-led interpretations caused by the reader's

⁵⁶ Lois Tyson, *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*, third edition. (London: Routledge, 2015), 161-197.

subjectivity. In this respect, Fish extends ranges of usage of “affective” from feelings to stylistics. He said, “I intend more than the range of feelings (what Wimsatt and Beardsley call “the purely affective reports”). The category of response includes any and all of the activities provoked by a string of words.”⁵⁷ As Tyson points out, Fish’s early idea seems to be transactional, but Fish claims it is not. For Fish, the text is not an “objective, autonomous entity,” but it is structured (perceived) throughout as the reader’s response “from moment to moment.”⁵⁸ Later, Fish’s idea expands to the fifth model of reader-response criticism (the social-pragmatic model). According to Fish, all readers are members of particular interpretive communities (social groups in terms of Halbwachs). Therefore his emphasis on the learned reader is not coincidental. Unlike the case of Iser and Fish, the third and fourth models are instead more focused on the subjective (David Bleich) and psychological (Norman Holland) aspects of the individual reader him/herself.

In biblical scholarship, the transactional model between text and reader is well known. The starting point of this model is not the actual reading process, but the hypothetical, imaginary, ideal reading process that follows the textual framework. So, we can say that this model is located between textual objectivism and reader-centered subjectivism. In this respect, we can imagine Iser’s implied reader, Eco’s model reader, or Gibson’s mock reader—whether or not

⁵⁷ Stanley Fish, “Literature in the Reader: : Affective Stylistics (1982)” in *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 27. However, his use of “affective” is also quite different from the way recent affective studies uses it. As Tyler Bradway points out, “Despite his use of the phrase “affective criticism... because Fish characteristically included all cognitive events within the category of response, affect remained an opaque and under-theorized aspect of reader relations.” Tyler Bradway, *Queer Experimental Literature: The Affective Politics of Bad Reading* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), xxxv.

⁵⁸ Tyson, *Critical Theory Today*, 167.

each concept is slightly different.⁵⁹ This reader is one who is not intended by the real author, but implied within the text itself phenomenologically and virtually. In this respect, the concept of implied reader is focused on the text's implicit openness. That is to say, the implied reader is required to fill or complete gaps within the text. Meir Sternberg's narratological form-critic model of gap-filling is based on this line as we discussed in Chapter One. Edgar Conrad is a classical scholar who applied this theory of the implied reader into the final form structure of the Book of Isaiah. He focuses on the "we" of both bookends in ch. 1 and chs. 65-66 and identifies this implied audience as the community of survivors who were in conflict with "they," the opposite group.⁶⁰ However, as Melugin critically points out, his understanding of implied reader is not clear:

The general directions of Conrad's arguments seems clear, but at points I am uncertain as to the nature of his argument. For example, he seems to distinguish between himself as a "real reader" of a text and the text's "implied reader." What he means by "real reader" seems clear, but how he understands "implied reader" is not so clear. He speaks of the implied reader in terms of what "the text implied about how it is to be read." He even speaks of an "encoded audience," as if the implied reader is a construct of the text, i.e., the audience which the text imagines as its audience. But if meaning cannot be generated apart from "real readers" who create reading strategies by which they can construct meaning, can an "implied reader" be purely what is encoded in the text?⁶¹

Melugin is right. Conrad is confusing the real reader and the implied reader. Conrad's "implied audience" in the final form of the Book of Isaiah is not a phenomenological, virtual

⁵⁹ Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974); *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980); *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

⁶⁰ Edgar W. Conrad, *Reading Isaiah* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991).

⁶¹ Roy F. Melugin, "The Book of Isaiah and the Construction of Meaning" in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. vol. 1, 49.

reader who fills the gaps within the text itself. Instead, it is more closely related to Fish's interpretive communities because Conrad's reader is linked with a specific time and place in historical reality (community of survivors). In the case of Archibald L. H. M. van Wieringen, he more faithfully tries to apply the concept of the implied reader to his reading of Isaiah 6-12.⁶² His understanding of it is more closely related to Seymour Chatman's narrative communication diagram⁶³ that includes Iser's implied reader and Booth's implied author, who is also a virtual and ideal author of the text distinguished from the real author.⁶⁴ In other words, Wieringen's point of view is on narrative dynamics more than it is on reader-response. Kathryn Pfisterer Darr is more closely connected with Isar's transactional model: "With Darr (here, her spouse John. A. Darr), then, I stand alongside critics such as Iser and W. Booth (parentheses is mine)."⁶⁵ She continues to cite from John A. Darr's dissertation in 1987 (published later in 1998),

Texts have a certain determinacy, but the meanings derived from these texts are qualified by the receptivity and creativity of the individual reader in an interpretive community. This qualification of the determinateness of texts leads us to admit the possibility (indeed, probability) of a variety of valid readings for a given text. However, I hold that this variety is limited by constraints both intrinsic and extrinsic to the text. The responsibility for maintaining a delicate balance between text and reader in the dialectical production of literary meaning lies with the critic; at this point artistry is the interpretive enterprise.⁶⁶

⁶² Archibald L. H. M. van Wieringen, *The Implied Reader in Isaiah 6-12* (Leiden: Brill, 1998); Amelia Devin Freedman, *God as an Absent Character in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Literary-Theoretical Study* (New York: Peter Lang, 2005), 60-67.

⁶³ Real author → [Implied author → (Narrator) → (Narratee) → Implied reader] → Real reader. See, Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978), 151.

⁶⁴ For the reader, it is perceived as the authorial character. Sometimes, this implied author is usually muddled with the narrator but here it is not. Wayne Booth, *Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961).

⁶⁵ Kathryn Pfisterer Darr, *Isaiah's Vision and the Family of God*, LCBI (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 26.

⁶⁶ John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*, JSNTSup 163 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 34-35. = "'Glorified in the Presence of Kings,'" A Literary-Critical Study of Herod in the Tetrarch in Luke-Acts." (PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 1987), 38-39.

Darr's dialectical model between text and reader is another name of Iser's transactional model. As Iser does, Darr is also standing in between textual determinacy (whether or not it says it is given or determinate) and indeterminacy (what he is calling textual gap). However, as Freedman points out, John A. Darr does not clearly divide the line between the real reader and the implied reader because "he believes that he can identify the ancient real readers (first-time readers) for whom the author wrote from the implied reader (critics) of Luke-Acts. (parentheses are mine)"⁶⁷ If we are considering the implied reader as the ideal character which is raised by the text itself, this presupposition should be dismissed because of theoretical defects. There are no such things as the first-time implied reader or informed implied reader. These are oxymorons.

However, Katheryn Pfisterer Darr, unlike her spouse, does not enforce narratological observation by critics on historical reconstruction of first-time readers: "Unlike first-time readers, critics read and re-read a literary work until it appears a 'complete mental object' whose recurring features take their places within the larger overall design." While contemporary critics read and re-read the complete literary work, first-time readers are very limited in their ability to do it: "First-time readers engaging a text sequentially in a dialogical process must contend with a limited field of vision. They cannot compare parts to whole because, immersed though they be in the text, they are able to actualize it only to the point read *thus far*."⁶⁸ Her text-specific and sequential reader of Isaiah's vision is close to the latter who hold extra-text knowledge, such as

⁶⁷ Freedman, *God as an Absent Character*, 47.

⁶⁸ K. P. Darr, *Isaiah's Vision*, 28-29.

redactors, scribes, and other specialists who were contributing for the collections and its interpretation of the final-form Isaian literature.

Who is “our reader” of Isaiah’s vision? He belongs to post-exilic Israel’s cognoscenti, a scribe or religious leader and educator enjoying such legal rights and social standing as were possible at the beginning of the fourth-century BCE, and under Persian rule. Culturally-literate and fully at home within his society, he knows - or at least thinks he knows - basic facts (historical, political, geographical, religious, ethnic) and conventions (social, cultural, literary, etc.) related to Israel and its world. Though this is his first reading of Isaiah, he is familiar with other of Israel’s existing religious texts, including the Torah of Moses, certain prophetic collections, psalms, and so on. He also knows the literary “classics” of his larger culture. For the vast majority of his contemporaries, of course, access to Isaiah consists only of listening to brief excerpts in contexts of worship...But our reader, a minority in his society, enjoys the opportunity, access, expertise and time to read and interpret the unfolding Isaiah scroll on other than a pericope by pericope basis.⁶⁹

As Melugin comments, characteristic of this reader in her last statement above is her construction which “is not encoded in the text.”⁷⁰ Nevertheless, it is necessary to pay attention to Darr’s first-time reader (ironically, she chose a male pronoun here) who is based on the standardization of scriptures by scribes, particularly during the transition from the Persian to the Hellenistic period. She admits that this literate reader shares cultural and historical memory from his ancestors within his community. The carrier of this collective memory (in terms of Darr, it would be Isaiah’s vision) is a family metaphor to sequentially connect the past and the present to each other. Her concept of “sequential reader” appears in this respect. She pays attention to “how female and child imagery contributes to our reader’s sequential construal of Isaiah as a coherent literary work.”⁷¹ In other words, she takes the family metaphor as the *leitmotif* throughout the

⁶⁹ K. P. Darr, *Isaiah’s Vision*, 30.

⁷⁰ Melugin, “The Book of Isaiah and the Construction of Meaning,” 49.

⁷¹ K. P. Darr, *Isaiah’s Vision*, 45.

final form structure of the Book of Isaiah. For her, metaphor is more than rhetorical artistry and persuasion I. A. Richards and M. Black argue: "I reject formalist theories that define metaphors as a phenomenon of word meaning while bracketing out context...Nevertheless, context remains crucial to metaphorical construal."⁷² Her rejection of formalism and emphasis on the contextuality of metaphor will be discussed in the next section.

Let us go back to the reader-response theory. The advantage of Iser's transactional, intersubjective, and receptive approach is very clear: it shows how one who is to receive a message or read a text (whether or not that person is called reader, receiver, redactor, hearer, narratee, audience, and etc) perceives and participates in the production of meanings throughout this dialogic process with the text(s). In terms of Bakhtin, this process would be called authoring in the space of carnivalization. This may be a hint to reconstruct how the ancient scribal redactors were making meanings by not only collecting, arranging, copying, but also by rereading, supplementing, interpreting. The problem is, the examples above show that Iser's phenomenological reader is not well fitted with what biblical scholars, who are embracing diachrony and synchrony both, intended because this type of reader is inferred from the text itself, not from the historical reality. For solving this problem, it is necessary to find an alternative model to view the ancient reception of the previous tradition as the reader-response.

Fish has admitted that Iser's approach has some advantages that can open a gate for readers: "In Iser's theory, however, the reader is given a more prominent role because what the text contains is not a meaning, however complex, but a set of directions for assembling a

⁷² K. P. Darr, *Isaiah's Vision*, 44. (see also, 38-39)

meaning, directions he will carry out in his own way."⁷³ However, Fish raises a question about the fact that Iser's epistemological distinction between determinacy (textual segments, schemata, or given) and indeterminacy (links and motivations of textual segments, or supplied) is not very clear because "if the "textual signs" do not announce their shape but appear in a variety of shapes according to the differing expectations and assumptions of different readers, and if gaps are not built into the text, but appear (or do not appear) as a consequence of particular interpretive strategies, then there is no distinction between what the text gives and what the reader supplies."⁷⁴ For Fish, there is no such thing as the text as the part of the world as an absolute objective and pure status prior to the reader who is guided and shaped by it without any interruptions. This is too idealistic. Instead of focusing on the reader's perception of indeterminacy or gaps, blanks, which need to be supplied by him/herself, within the given text, Fish moves on to show/discuss that the text (and the world) is mediated by the reader who led "by virtue of his membership in a community of interpretation."⁷⁵ He says,

But it is precisely that purity I have been calling into question by pointing out on the one hand that perception is always mediated (and therefore objects are never available directly), and on the other that perception is always conventional (and therefore readers are never free). In the absence of that purity one can say either that everything is determinate, because nothing proceeds from an unfettered imagination, or that everything is indeterminate, because everything is produced by the activities of the reader (but by a reader who is, like what he produces, community property). The only thing that you can't say is that there is a distinction, at least insofar as it is an absolute distinction, between a world that "lives and functions independently" of interpretive activity and a world that is produced by interpretive activity.⁷⁶

⁷³ Stanley Fish, "Why No One's Afraid of Wolfgang Iser: The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response by Wolfgang Iser" *Diacritics* 11.1 (1981), 4.

⁷⁴ Fish, "Why No One's Afraid of Wolfgang Iser," 7.

⁷⁵ Fish, "Why No One's Afraid of Wolfgang Iser," 11.

⁷⁶ Fish, "Why No One's Afraid of Wolfgang Iser," 12.

Against Fish's criticism, Iser claims that he does not identify the literary world with the real world as Fish assumes: "One should not confuse reality with interpretation of reality."⁷⁷ Also, Iser points out that Fish misread Iser's tripartite distinction into a duality in his response to Fish in 1981: "The words of a text are given, the interpretation of the words is determinate, and the gaps between given elements and interpretations are the indeterminacies. The real world is given, our interpretation of the world is determinate, the gaps between given elements and/or our interpretations are the indeterminacies."⁷⁸ However he did not mention this but seems to hold a dual distinction in his one-year-earlier interview with Rudolf E. Kuenzli, Norman Holland, Wayne Booth, and Stanley Fish in 1980: "The objection seems to me to be based on the false assumption that my key terms determinacy and indeterminacy represent something given. They do not. What is given is textual segments; the links and motivations of these segments are indeterminate, but take on an ever increasing degree of determinacy (at least in traditional forms of literature) through the process of interpretation. The relation between indeterminacy and determinacy is basic to all kinds of interaction and interpretation."⁷⁹ This inconsistency is what Fish rightly points out. Also the more serious problem of Iser's 1981 response is, as Michael Bérubé pointed out, he identifies interpretation as determinate one and the word of the text with the real one under the name of "given."⁸⁰ Ironically, as Robert Holub comments, Iser also confuses Fish's obscure uses of 'givens.' On the one hand Fish admits something is actually

⁷⁷ Norman N. Holland and Wayne C. Booth., "Interview: Wolfgang Iser" in *Prospecting* (1989). 66. = *Diacritics* 10.2. (1980), 57-74.

⁷⁸ Wolfgang Iser, "Talk like Whales: A Reply to Stanley Fish" in *Diacritics* 11.3 (1981), 83.

⁷⁹ Iser, "Interview," 67.

⁸⁰ Michael Bérubé, "There Is Nothing Inside the Text; or, Why No One's Heard of Wolfgang Iser" in *Rhetorical Occasions: Essays on Humanities*. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 102.

given in the text, but on the other hand, he argues that these givens are meaningless “before we endow them with meaning as ‘givens.’”⁸¹ In this vein, gaps are not confined to the links and motivations of textual segments, instead those are “only where you - that is, where your interpretive assumptions (which are learned from your interpretive community) - find them. (parenthesis is mine)”⁸² So, Fish’s interest is more on the real and actual reader than the implied reader. In this way, Fish goes further from Iser’s pluralism.

His famous anecdote in his 1980 article “Is There a Text in This Class?” shows that the text is not predetermined but it is dependent on how the reader (pre)determines and constructs it.⁸³ The purpose of his storytelling is to show how his colleague does not misread “but mispreread (*italics is his*)” what this student asks while he does not pay much attention to the literal meaning. This student is not asking about what is the textbook in the classroom, but about how the teacher views the text(s). Then, Fish shows how this man fixes his structure of (pre)determination in particular situations where he acquired some knowledge: “Ah, there’s one of Fish’s victims!”⁸⁴

In his 1976 article “Interpreting the *Variorum*,” he says that interpretive communities “are made up [those] who share interpretive strategies not for reading (in the conventional sense) but for writing texts, for constituting their properties and assigning their intentions. In other words, these strategies exist prior to the act of reading and therefore determine the shape of what

⁸¹ Robert Holub, “Reception Theory: School of Constance,” in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 8, From Formalism to Poststructuralism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 338.

⁸² Michael Bérubé, “There Is Nothing Inside the Text,” 101.

⁸³ Stanley Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 305.

⁸⁴ Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class?*, 311-13.

is read rather than, as is usually assumed, the other way around.”⁸⁵ Here again, he emphasizes what is (pre)determined in the reader before he or she begins reading. According to Fish, it is a socially constructed framework that gives a frame of reference for the actual reader. In this vein, we can call this reader the “learned or informed reader” because “interpretive strategies are not natural or universal, but learned.”⁸⁶ We can call the conventional frame of reference one’s belief system, ideology or even theology (however, the latter is not Fish’s interest). So, all individuals’ reading would be varied depending on which group he or she belongs to. There is no one-directional, universal reading in this reality. As Bakhtin does in his reading of Dostoyevsky, Fish’s reading is multi-directional communication by one who is joining a particular socio-cultural frame of reference. In this sense, reading is writing (as Roland Barthes does). So, Fishian reading is very close to Bakhtinian authoring and intertextuality. He concludes,

We see then that (1) communication does occur, despite the absence of an independent and context-free system of meanings, that (2) those who participate in this communication do so confidently rather than provisionally (they are not relativists), and that (3) while their confidence has its source in a set of beliefs, those beliefs are not individual-specific or idiosyncratic but communal and conventional (they are not solipsists).⁸⁷

For those who might be worried about such expressions as “believe in,” it is necessary to make clear this expression in Fish’s anecdote does not contain any theological nuances. However, some theologians like Anthony C. Thiselton and Kevin J. Vanhoozer believe that Fishian reading is very dangerous to the conventional Christian reading the Scripture because of

⁸⁵ Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class?*, 171. (See also, 14)

⁸⁶ Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class?*, 48-9, 172.

⁸⁷ Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class?*, 321.

its subjectivity and plurality in the reading process. Both chief interests are more theological or religio-philosophical than literary criticism itself. Thiselton criticizes Fish for being “more interested in the *non-consequences*” of his theory than in its consequences. (emphasis is his)” because of his anti-formalism, anti-foundationalism, neopragmatism, and relativism.⁸⁸ Then he continues to denounce Fish for not having enough philosophical knowledge of hermeneutics; “socio-pragmatic hermeneutics ultimately betrays the function which hermeneutics arose to perform.”⁸⁹ By comparing Fish and Ludwig Wittgenstien, the latter also stands on anti-formalist, Fishian hermeneutics lacks the awareness that “overlappings and interpretation also offer certain criss-crossings which constitute trans-contextual bridges.”⁹⁰ So, it is not true that we “must choose between the sharply-bounded crystalline purity of formalist concepts and the unstable concepts of contextual pragmatics. Concepts may function with a measure of operational stability, but with ‘blurred edges.’” However, William John Lyons rightly points out there is no big difference between Fish’s social conventions (what he calls rubrics in his anecdote) and Thiselton’s trans-contextual bridges.

The move which enables one to understand an utterance through the acquisition of these 'rubrics' through common roots indicates that at a certain level Fish's approach does allow the possibility of what Thiselton calls trans-contextual meaning through hermeneutical growth, the acquiring of a position from which to hear an utterance as intended by its speaker.⁹¹

⁸⁸ Anthony C. Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992), 537.

⁸⁹ Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*, 539.

⁹⁰ Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*, 541.

⁹¹ William John Lyons, *Canon and Exegesis: Canonical Praxis and the Sodom Narrative*, JSOTSup 352 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 113.

As a theologian, Thiselton suggests that this trans-contextual bridge would be the Christian Scripture as the canonical form of universal meta-text by rejecting dogmatic, unethical, and even idolatrous “a phenomenology of religious self-discovery.”⁹² However, this hysterical comment against Fish seems to involve somewhat circular-reasoning and is self-projecting because, as an Anglican priest, he also belongs to a certain interpretive community that reads a certain type of Christian canon with a particular theological frame of reference. Moreover, he fails to divide the dogmatism of a certain interpretive community from the anomie in the empty space of meta-narrative. They seem to conflict with each other in his argument. As Lyons points out, Thiselton “ignores the role of the Church of a ‘community of faith’ as the setting of the text.”⁹³

Like the case of Thiselton, Vanhoozer also commits the same error of circular-reasoning and self-projecting. Vanhoozer’s title *Is There a Meaning in This Text?* is more directly challenging against Fish’s 1980 work *Is There a Text in This Class?* His understanding of the Fishian concept of the text, the reader and its community looks generally fine. Unfortunately, he misreads (not *misprereads*) the term “believe in” the student’s question and her answer in Fish’s anecdote: “Do we *believe* in texts? ... Can the responsible critic (in this case the reader) also be a believer? (emphasis is his).”⁹⁴ From this point of view, he continues to identify the text with the truth and the reader with the believer: “‘Truth is demoted from its prior status as timeless and absolute’ to ‘what is good for us to believe here and now’ or ‘what works for me in this

⁹² Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics* (1992), 542-3, 545-6, 550.

⁹³ Lyons, *Canon and Exegesis*, 114.

⁹⁴ Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?*, 24.

situation.”⁹⁵ As an Evangelical-Reformed theologian, he wants to criticize Fish’s idea for lacking some self-critical principle like “how texts may challenge, and perhaps transform, the reader and the interpretive community.”⁹⁶ So, his proposal of ethical reading is going way beyond the original agenda of reader-response criticism: returning to the basic Protestant principle of *Sola Scriptura* by preserving the authority (otherness) of the text (Christian Scripture), not the authority of the interpretive community (as in the case of fundamentalist who controls the text under their authority), under divine guidance (the illumination of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of Reception), instead of focusing on the tensions within various interpretive communities in the human reality.⁹⁷ However, as we discussed above, Fish’s theory is not about one believing something metaphysical but about the reading process as a life experience within a social-cultural context. In this respect, Vanhoozer also commits the same error of circular-reasoning and self-projecting because they ironically prove that they are also informed or learned readers who cannot free themselves from their interpretive communities whether or not they believe the certain religious cannon to be the metatextual or logocentric source of the absolute truth. Furthermore, as we discussed in Chapters One and Two, biblical texts have long been formed over a few centuries before the standardization of the final form and following canonization later. As James A. Sanders rightly points out, the process of canonization is dependent on interpretations of each canonical community. In this vein, Sanders’s method of the interpretive midrash of the canonical community is well fit with Fishian interpretive communities.

⁹⁵ Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?*, 57.

⁹⁶ Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?*, 170.

⁹⁷ Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?*, 383, 412-3, 424-5.

So far, we discuss how the collective memory as the convection of the interpretive communities is important to understanding the reception of tradition (redaction) within the process of the formation of the ancient biblical texts. It is a dialogic process between the past and the present. It does not belong to a tradent's dream-like unconsciousness, but its socio-cultural environment that encompasses each tradents. The present reception of the past event or story not only means mechanical memorization and dictation in the pedagogical and liturgical setting, it also entails active collective interpretation to adjust and adapt to the time and space they live in. It is not just literary-historical, but also socio-cultural activity. Therefore, as the bearer of collective memory, any of tradents (receivers of tradition) encompassed by its interpretive communities cannot be free from the socio-cultural nexus and its conventions. If we hypothetically suggest that the redactor (final author) of Trito-Isaiah (the final form of the Trito-Isaian collection) is an individual, he does not need to be a subject who is independent of any variables. His language practices and uses of metaphors would be rooted in his embodied experience with socio-cultural communication in Persian Yehud.

3.3. Conceptual Metaphor

George Lakoff, in his magnum opus *Metaphors We Live By*, co-authored with Mark Johnson in 1980, deals with how metaphor is conceptualized (or framed) in in the human body and in socio-cultural experience. Later his theory is developed into how conceptual metaphor works in contemporary public communication, especially under the American two-party system. In other words, metaphor is not only a matter of literary artistry and rhetorical persuasion but

also a matter of our living everyday communication. One of the other premises of Lakoff-Johnson is that metaphor is not established word by word, but structured conceptually. Therefore, the everydayness and conceptualization of metaphor is the starting point of Lakoff-Johnson's theory of conceptual metaphor.

Lakoff-Johnson's theory is rooted in the interaction theory of metaphor. Ivor Armstrong Richards, in his *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1937), criticizes Aristotle's generalization of "the common eye" of resemblances to the mimetic practice in poetic and rhetorical artistry. Instead, he calls on us to admit differences in the real speech and focuses more on its metaphorical structure (its constitutive form).⁹⁸ In this respect, he technically divides components of metaphor into-tenor and vehicle. The former is the original subject being described and the latter is the supplementary one that describes figuratively the former.⁹⁹ Although Richards criticizes Aristotle's generalization, he is going on to find the "particulars" of resemblance (or common characteristic) between tenor and vehicle to show how they interact with each other.¹⁰⁰ His definition of metaphor is this: "In the simplest formulation, when we use a metaphor we have *two thoughts of different things* active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction. (highlight is mine)"¹⁰¹

Max Black, in his 1962 work, expands Richards' interaction theory. He criticizes earlier models like substitution and comparison views that are confined only to literal translation, not

⁹⁸ Ivor Armstrong Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), 87-88.

⁹⁹ Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 96-99. This relationship of tenor and vehicle is equivalent with Saussure's signified and signifier.

¹⁰⁰ Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 115-138.

¹⁰¹ Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 93.

metaphorical reading.¹⁰² He is more interested in how metaphor is framed in the sentence level, not just word-by-word interaction. Let us see his example “The chairman plowed through the discussion.” Here the *focus* of the metaphor is “plowed.” The rest of the sentence is regarded as the *frame*.¹⁰³ Furthermore, Black modifies Richards’s *two thoughts of different things* (tenor and vehicle) into *two distinct subjects*, a principal subject and a subsidiary one, which are regarded as “systems of things, rather than “things.”¹⁰⁴ By calling it subjects, he emphasizes that it is not just about words, but about ideas.¹⁰⁵ In this respect, he continues to show how the “Man is a wolf” metaphor works as a system of ideas through a process. When one reads a wolf in a literal sense, one is reminded of it from “the system of associated commonplaces” in one’s given culture.¹⁰⁶ Then, a wolf as the secondary subject is matched with a primary subject throughout the process of screening, filtering, or projection.¹⁰⁷ By doing this, Black shows that there is a “conceptual archetype” (as a modification of Stephen C. Pepper’s root metaphor) which is “a systematic repertoire of ideas by means of which a given thinker describes, by *analogical extension*, some domain to which those ideas do not immediately and literally apply.”¹⁰⁸ However, Black’s focus/frame structure of sentence and primary/secondary subject are criticized by Janet Martin Soskice (1985) who strongly prefers Richards’ theory. According to Darr’s reference on Sockice,

¹⁰² Max Black, *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962), 31-37.

¹⁰³ Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 27-28.

¹⁰⁴ His note on terminology, see Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 44.

¹⁰⁵ Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 1, 39.

¹⁰⁶ Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 40. “In addition, I am suggesting, literal uses of the word normally commit the speaker to acceptance of a set of standard beliefs about wolves (current platitudes) that are the common possession of the members of some speech community.”

¹⁰⁷ Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 41-2. In this respect, he introduces his seven principles of his interaction theory. See also, 44-45.

¹⁰⁸ Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 241.

Black “misconstrues Richards” and “errs in stating that every metaphor contains two subjects.”¹⁰⁹ But this does not take Darr back to the classical division of tenor and vehicle. Instead, “because of potential pitfalls,” she tries to follow new terms proposed by J. David Sapir (continuous and discontinuous terms with topic of discourse). However, Darr does not continue to use this in the following discussion as Andrea Weiss points out it is “rarely used.”¹¹⁰

While Soskice is turning back to Richards, Eva Feder Kittay (1987) develops Richards-Black’s interaction theory to her own perspectival theory. Her emphasis on structural, conceptual, and cognitive aspects of metaphor seems very similar to Lakoff and Johnson’s concerns, but she does not agree very much with the everydayness of metaphor. Following Black’s distinction between literal and metaphorical language, she criticizes Lakoff and Johnson who confuse them: “If we deny the literal in language, we deny the possibility of metaphor as well.”¹¹¹ It should be known that each of them do not share the same philosophical premises. While Kittay is standing in the objectivist view (literal language cannot be metaphorical), Lakoff and Johnson are holding experimentalism while saying no “objectivist obsession with absolute truth or the subjectivist insistence that imagination is totally unrestricted.”¹¹² Nevertheless, her perspectival observation is helpful to understand how the metaphor is conceptualized in the semantic field. After reviewing Richards and Black’s concepts, she concludes that both are not

¹⁰⁹ K. P. Darr, *Isaiah’s Vision*, 38; Janet Martin Soskice, *Metaphors and Religious Language* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 48.

¹¹⁰ K. P. Darr, *Isaiah’s Vision*, 39; Andrea L. Weiss, *Figurative Language in Biblical Prose Narrative: Metaphor in the Book of Samuel* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 24; J. David Sapir “The Anatomy of Metaphor,” in *The Social Use of Metaphor*, ed. J. David Sapir and J. Christopher Crocker (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), 3-32.

¹¹¹ Eva Feder Kittay, *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 20, 50.

¹¹² Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 209, 228.

fully enough able to articulate conceptual and semantic aspects of metaphor. So, she decides to retain Richards' vehicle with a sense of transportation of meaning and replace his tenor into "topic" because it is not "an expression in a text, but rather what a text is speaking about."¹¹³ In this vein, she expands with her attention to metaphor into structural semantic fields. Following Saussurean's division on a level of expression (*signifié*/signified) and a level of content (*signifiant*/signifier), she equates vehicle with the first and topic with the latter. Under this understanding of metaphor as the element of the linguistic system, she talks about metaphorical transposition from the semantic field of the vehicle to the content domain of the topic.¹¹⁴

Both vehicle and topic are elements of semantic fields—or more precisely the vehicle is an element of a semantic field while the topic is part of some content domain that may not be articulated by a set of lexical items. *Contra* Black, not only ought the topic to be considered as a part of a system (a content domain or a semantic field), the vehicle ought to be understood as being part of its own system as well.¹¹⁵

While Kittay is focusing on metaphor as semantic structure behind her objectivist viewpoint on the literal and metaphorical language, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) are standing on different points of view to approach the conceptual metaphor. As we discussed above, they focus on the everydayness of metaphor in light of their experimentalist perspective. Their inductive approach begins to discuss orientational metaphors (physical), ontological metaphors (nonphysical by physical), then structural/conceptual metaphors (complex concepts). According to them, metaphors (including metonymies) are not random or arbitrary cases, but have coherent

¹¹³ Kittay, *Metaphor*, 26-27.

¹¹⁴ Kittay, *Metaphor*, 165.

¹¹⁵ Kittay, *Metaphor*, 34

systems (more than consistency) in terms of how complex concepts are fitting together with each other.¹¹⁶

Although the two metaphors are not consistent (that is, they form no single image), they nonetheless "fit together," by virtue of being subcategories of a major category and therefore sharing a major common entailment. There is a difference between metaphors that are coherent (that is, "fit together") with each other and those that are consistent. We have found that the connections between metaphors are more likely to involve coherence than consistency.¹¹⁷

First, orientational metaphors show how we express our spatial concept that is based on our physical and cultural experience. Such spatial expressions like up-down, in-out, front-back, on-off, central-peripheral are rooted in our body orientation. For instance, we express our feelings (happy-sad), cultural value (good-bad, virtue-depravity, rational-emotional), and social status (high-low) using the UP-DOWN metaphor. We can say that all these up-cases have coherence of UP orientation to general well-being.¹¹⁸ This shows that our cultural values deeply link with our physical understanding of UP-DOWN. However, it does not mean that "all cultural values coherent with a metaphorical system actually exist, only that those that do exist and are deeply entrenched are consistent with the metaphorical system."¹¹⁹ Depending on each (sub)culture, such UP-DOWN orientation would be differently manifested. Lakoff and Johnson give an example of how Americans differently value buying a car between two conflicting concepts, BIGGER IS BETTER and SAVING MONEY IS BETTER, based on UP orientation.

¹¹⁶ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 18, 37, 44.

¹¹⁷ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 44.

¹¹⁸ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 18.

¹¹⁹ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 22-23.

These cultural values consist of different conceptualizations of metaphor although it is coherent with our body orientation.

Second, Lakoff and Johnson turn their attention to ontological metaphors which are not closely related with orientation. Like previous cases, “our experiences with physical objects (especially our own bodies) provide the basis for an extraordinarily wide variety of ontological metaphors” such as entity and substance metaphors and container metaphors (land areas, visual fields, events, actions, activities, and states).¹²⁰ INFLATION IS AN ENTITY is a typical example of this. Here the term inflation is an abstract phenomena of rising prices in the contemporary economy. When we say “*Inflation is lowering* our standard of living” or “We need to *combat inflation*,” the concept of inflation becomes an entity that impacts our lives. Viewing it as an entity, allows us “to refer to it, quantify it, identify a particular aspect of it, see it as a cause, act with respect to it, and perhaps even believe that we understand it.”¹²¹ By doing this, we can estimate our purpose for the nonphysical things in the physical schema. Personification (nonhuman as human) and metonymy are also explained in this line of thoughts. If we say “Inflation *has attacked* the foundation of our economy” or “Our biggest *enemy* right now is inflation,” here inflation is personified in a specific form, AN ADVERSARY.¹²² We know that here inflation does not refer to a personal being. However, in the case of metonymy, it functions differently. In the case of “The *ham sandwich* is waiting for his check,” here the ham sandwich refers not to a food itself, but to someone who ordered it. Lakoff and Johnson argue that metonymic concepts are not random, but systemic just as is the case of metaphoric concepts.

¹²⁰ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 25.

¹²¹ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 27.

¹²² Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 33-34.

Metonymic concepts allow us to conceptualize one thing by means of its relation to some-thing else. When we think of a *Picasso*, we are not just thinking of a work of art alone, in and of itself. We think of it in terms of its relation to the artist, that is, his conception of art, his technique, his role in art history, etc. We act with reverence toward a *Picasso*, even a sketch he made as a teen-ager, because of its relation to the artist. This is a way in which the PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT metonymy affects both our thought and our action.¹²³

Lastly, Lakoff and Johnson discuss structural or conceptual metaphors, which are the core of their discussions on how our conceptual system is “fundamentally” metaphorical in nature. “To use one highly structured and clearly delineated concept to structure another,” structural metaphors are more than orientation and ontological metaphors.¹²⁴ For them, there is nothing that is “purely emergent or purely metaphorical,” not even a basic concept like CAUSATION.¹²⁵ While standard theory considers this concept as the ultimate building block of meaning that is made of indecomposable primitives, they argue that even this basic concept CAUSATION should be regarded as a metaphorical concept rooted in its prototypical core of DIRECT MANIPULATION (MAKING), “which emerges directly from our experience” since we have learned and practiced how to manipulate our environment. This prototypical core of CAUSATION is “not an unanalyzable semantic primitive but rather a gestalt consisting of properties that naturally occur together in our daily experience of performing direct manipulations” in our conceptual mind.¹²⁶ In sum, the concept of CAUSATION is an abstract,

¹²³ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 39

¹²⁴ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 62.

¹²⁵ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 69.

¹²⁶ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 75.

metaphorical idea based on coherent experiential gestalts (emergent metaphorical concept based on our experience) on how to manipulate our surroundings (direct emergent concept).¹²⁷

Let us have a look at a typical (rational) example ARGUMENT IS WAR. Although each term talks about different concepts, both “partly” share terms of battle. By doing this, the argument as the nonphysical verbal battle shares some similar conceptual mechanism with war as the physical battle because human’s rational reasoning still has linguistic tactics like intimidation, threat, authority, insults, belittling, challenging authority, evading the issue, bargaining, and flattery. In other words, “not only our conception of an argument but the way we carry it out is grounded in our knowledge and experience of physical combat.”¹²⁸ Interestingly, this mechanism is found even within those who believe “that rational arguments in their ideal form are supposed to transcend” academic and religious discussions. The ultimate goal of this analysis is to show conceptual coherence between these two conceptual domains by using six categorial dimensions (participants, parts, stages, linear sequence, causation, purpose). In other words, it is to show that experiential gestalts are structured multidimensionally as wholes.

Understanding a conversation as being an argument involves being able to superimpose the multidimensional structure of part of the concept WAR upon the corresponding structure CONVERSATION. Such multidimensional structures characterize *experiential gestalts*, which are ways of organizing experiences into *structured wholes*. In the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor, the gestalt for CONVERSATION IS structured further by means of correspondences with selected elements of the gestalt for WAR. Thus one

¹²⁷ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 119. Read, the statement in 81. “CAUSATION is considered as a directly emergent concept” is typo. Here it talks about CONVERSATION as “a directly emergent concept” that functions as coherent experiential gestalt that has such dimensions like participants, parts, stages, linear sequence, purpose.

¹²⁸ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 63. “All of these experiences may be just as basic as physical experiences. Rather, what we are claiming about grounding is that we typically conceptualize the nonphysical *in terms of* the physical—that is, we conceptualize the less clearly delineated in terms of the more clearly delineated.” in 59.

activity, talking, is understood in terms of another, physical fighting. Structuring our experience in terms of such multidimensional gestalts is what makes our experience *coherent*. We experience a conversation as an argument when the WAR gestalt fits our perceptions and actions in the conversation.¹²⁹

Such gestalts, which constitute each domain of experience within metaphoric dynamics, are “experientially basic” that “represent coherent organizations of our experiences in terms of natural dimensions (parts, stages, causes, etc.).” So, it is included as natural like our body experience, interactions with the physical environment, and interactions with others in our culture: “Some may be universal, while others will vary from culture to culture.”¹³⁰ There is no fixed objective form of categorization because all things are interactional in our experience.¹³¹ In this respect, they reject the myths of both objectivism and subjectivism, instead making a bridge between them throughout their empirical approach based on observing body and culture. Lakoff and Johnson’s criticism is slightly more inclined to criticize Enlightenment Reason. Like the case of Fish, this line of thought is based on British Empiricism and American Pragmatism contra Continental Rationalism.

What we are offering in the experientialist account of understanding and truth is an alternative which denies that subjectivity and objectivity are our only choices. We reject the objectivist view that there is absolute and unconditional truth without adopting the subjectivist alternative of truth as obtainable only through the imagination, unconstrained by external circumstances. The reason we have focused so much on metaphor is that it unites reason and imagination. Reason, at the very least, involves categorization, entailment, and inference. Imagination, in one of its many aspects, involves seeing one kind of thing in terms of another kind of thing—what we have called metaphorical thought. Metaphor is thus *imaginative rationality*. Since the categories of our everyday

¹²⁹ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 81.

¹³⁰ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 117-8.

¹³¹ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 122.

thought are largely metaphorical and our everyday reasoning involves metaphorical entailments and inferences, ordinary rationality is therefore imaginative by its very nature. Given our understanding of poetic metaphor in terms of metaphorical entailments and inferences, we can see that the products of the poetic imagination are, for the same reason, partially rational in nature.¹³²

In a word, conceptual metaphor is mapping from one source domain to another target one. This distinction between source and target domain is introduced in a newly added afterword in the 2003 edition of their work. Here the former and the latter are equivalent with the relationship between vehicle and tenor/topic (in terms of Kittay, the semantic field and the content domain). As Lakoff and Johnson point out, for understanding how conceptual metaphor works, these two metaphorical concepts should be dismissed. The first one is a mathematical mapping metaphor. It is useful to explain systematic correspondences by drawing diagrams of functional relations. But it is different from how conceptual metaphor works because it creates target entities. The second one is the projection metaphor. This model shows analogously how the structure of source is projected onto that the target as entities while preserving coherent image-schemas. However, it also has limitations because not all of the source domains are mapped. Therefore, following Michael J. Reddy's redefinition of Donald Schön's objectivist view in 1979, they suggest a conduit metaphor as the alternative model to analogously explain how the conceptual mapping is working from source domain to target domain as entities "but

¹³² Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 192-93. Lakoff and Johnson's criticism is slightly more inclined to criticize Enlightenment Reason. This line of thought is based on British Empiricism and American Pragmatism against Continental Rationalism. To read more, see George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh*. Jaewoong Jung subscribes to this embodied approach to human reason by rejecting Cartesian dualism. Jaewoong Jung, *Fullfilled in Our Bodies: Embodied Experience of the Divine Presence in Preaching* (PhD diss., Garrett-Evangelical Theoloical Seminary, 2020), 135-36.

partially.”¹³³ Language is a conduit or pipeline that transfers thoughts. A speaker or writer packs (inserts) their concepts in words. Through words, concepts are delivered to a listener or a reader. Then a listener or a reader unpacks (extracts) ideas from those words. We should take care that Reddy viewed the idea that his predecessors trivialize the role of listener or reader.¹³⁴ However, as James V. Wertsch points out from the Bakhtinian point of view, he still schematizes the listener or reader within a framework and limits its role to extraction from the linguistic pipeline: “In the framework of the conduit metaphor, the listener's task must be one of extraction. He must find the meaning ‘in the words’ and take it out of them, so that it gets ‘into his head.’”¹³⁵ As Ortony points out, it is because Reddy also uses the same constructivist analogy that Schön did.¹³⁶ Lakoff and Johnson’s experientialism are going further from this as we discussed above. Developing Joseph Grady’s primary metaphor in 1997, they are not only focusing on how the concrete experimental source domain is mapping with the abstract experimental target domain, but also observing how it is working inside the sensory-motor neuron system.¹³⁷

Lakoff and Johnson’s emphasis on everydayness of metaphor in relation to body and culture make room for how metaphor is conceptualized in public communication and performance. Lakoff, in his later work *Moral Politics* in 1996, applies his theory to analyze how Americans use their political languages conceptually and how that is relevant to people’s

¹³³ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 253-54.

¹³⁴ Michael J. Reddy, “The Conduit Metaphor: A Case of Frame Conflict in Our Language about Language,” in *Metaphor and Thought*, Second edition, ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 186.

¹³⁵ James V. Wertsch, *Voices of the Mind: Sociocultural Approach to Mediated Action* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991) 72-73. Reddy, “The Conduit Metaphor,” 168-186.

¹³⁶ Andrew Ortony, “Metaphor, Language, and Thought,” in *Metaphor and Thought*, 6.

¹³⁷ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 254-57. See also Joseph Edward Grady, *Foundations of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary Scenes* (PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 1997).

morality. He pays attention to the two types of family values in Americans' mindsets: strict father morality and nurturant parent morality. Clueing from these contrasting metaphorical concepts, he suggests that this could explain the contemporary American culture wars between conservatives and liberals. In this respect, he suggests that the first one forms the political rhetoric of Republicans and the latter one forms that of Democrats. By doing this, he shows that political decisions depend on the type of metaphorical conceptualization (or framing).¹³⁸ This is also applicable to religious discourse, in the case of Judeo-Christian tradition. Relying on Eve Sweetser's research, Lakoff discusses how Christian traditions diverged into two lines of thought based on two contradictory divine-parent models between strict and nurturant.¹³⁹ In fact, this is not the first case of problem posing. Sally McFague, in her magnum opus *Metaphorical Theology* in 1982 uses her technical term "model" with similar nuances with "concept," or "framework."

It should be evident that no one model, whether scientific or theological, is able to interpret adequately the networks of relationships that constitute the world, whether these be the structures intrinsic to physical phenomena or to human existence. The complexity of the subject matter makes such pretension impossible: metaphorical thinking is an acknowledgement of multiple interpretations and relativism in dealing with our world at this level.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸ George Lakoff, *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*, second edition (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), 65-142, 162-178. The first edition was published in 1996. The problems of variations on central models and biconceptualism will be discussed in the next section.

¹³⁹ Lakoff, *Moral Politics*, 245-262.

¹⁴⁰ Sally McFague, *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 137.

Developing McFague and Lakoff's discussion of GOD IS FATHER metaphor, Eve Sweetser and Mary Therese DesCamp (2005, 2014) analyzes how biblical text uses particular metaphorical concepts to describe the Divine-Human relationship by relying on cultural conventions. After revisiting oversimplification of a concrete-to-abstract mapping, they redefine metaphor "as typically conceptualizing a relatively *less intersubjectively* accessible domain or frame in terms of a *more intersubjectively accessible* domain or frame."¹⁴¹ Throughout mutual asymmetric relationships with parents, people have embodied experimental models of the ideal parents who are nurturant and protective.¹⁴² Since the Judeo-Christian tradition of monotheistic models allows a single mapping from one particular source frame, following the traditional view on father-mother power relationships, "the need to map power and authority trumped the need to map greater nurturance."¹⁴³ Then, using conceptual blending theory which was proposed by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner (2008), they show that every component of these concepts is not mapped to each other (actually, "partial conceptualization" is also emphasized by Lakoff and

¹⁴¹ Eve Sweetser and Mary Therese DesCamp, "Motivating Biblical Metaphors for God Refining the Cognitive Model," in *Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies*, ed. Eve Sweetser and Mary Therese DesCamp (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 10.

¹⁴² In this vein, they found two dominant frames fitting with "monotheistic models" in the Hebrew Bible and New Testament: the Fatherhood frame and the Kingship frame while both share subframes. Both mostly share subframes like 1) Protection and Sustenance; 2) Mutual Asymmetric Relationship; 3) Physical Control; 4) Change of State/Essence; 5) Authority; and 6) Destructive Power to Punish. However, unlike the case of father-son, the king-subject relationship could not have a level of attachment and share physical similarities and ongoing inheritance. Mary Therese DesCamp and Eve Sweetser, "Metaphors for God: Why and How Do Our Choices Matter for Humans? The Application of Contemporary Cognitive Linguistics Research to the Debate on God and Metaphor," *Pastoral Psychology* 53 (2005), 229.

¹⁴³ Sweetser and Therese DesCamp, "Motivating Biblical Metaphors," 14.

Johnson).¹⁴⁴ Concerning the Father-Son Parenting frame, we do not blend our conception of old fathers who need to be cared for by sons since God is omnipotent and immortal. However, Sweetser and DesCamp's analysis is very useful but it is limited at least when we all agree on such a canonical and theological framework. As they notice that "it is inevitable that metaphors will change as the target domains change," it is necessary to see how conceptual metaphors has been developed in the course of literary history of biblical texts as Lakoff and Johnson comment on poetry.¹⁴⁵

...metaphors in poetry are, for the most part, extensions and special cases of stable, conventional conceptual metaphors used in everyday thought and language. The metaphoric innovations of poets are shown thereby to consist not in the totally new creation of metaphoric thought but in the marshalling of already existing forms of metaphoric thought to form new extensions and combinations of old metaphorical mappings.¹⁴⁶

Even though the father-son relationship is dominant within our religious conceptual framework, it should not say that this is all of it. We can find another conceptual relationship like a husband-wife relationship without any mystical connotations.¹⁴⁷ Instead, this would be read in the socio-economic embodied experience in ancient times. Seong-Hyuk Hong (2006), following Kittay's semantic field theory and Lakoff-Johnson's coherence, also deals with the marriage and promiscuity metaphor as the subconcept under the family root metaphor in Hosea. These two

¹⁴⁴ Sweetser and Therese DesCamp, "Motivating Biblical Metaphors," 16; See also, Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending And The Mind's Hidden Complexities* (New York: Basic Books, 2002).

¹⁴⁵ Sweetser and Therese DesCamp, "Motivating Biblical Metaphors," 22.

¹⁴⁶ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 267-8.

¹⁴⁷ Sweetser and Therese DesCamp, "Motivating Biblical Metaphors," 19.

subconcepts are not only considered as religious corruption, but also aimed at criticizing internal socio-economic corruption in the eighth century Northern Israel (while highlighting the theme of recovery by using metaphor of illness and healing throughout the external factors in Hosea 5-7).¹⁴⁸

Job Jindo (2010) even goes further from this. He focuses on what metaphorical concepts are behind metaphors on the global and local level within the poetic languages in Jeremiah 1-24. On the one hand, THE COSMOS IS A STATE metaphor functions as the global metaphor (in the sense of ancient Mesopotamia world) for “the royal model of lawsuit and consequent destruction” to provide the structure of cosmic drama in Jeremiah 1-24. Whether oligarchic polytheism or autocratic monotheism, “the integrated model of human polity *as a whole* is systematically mapped onto the workings of the universe. (highlight is his)”¹⁴⁹ On the other hand, THE LAND OF ISRAEL IS YHWH’S ROYAL GARDEN metaphor constitutes the framework including family imagery and plant imagery for condemning the sixth century Judah and Jerusalem. In this case, Jindo suggests two horticultural models that humans are targeted as stewards and plants in the divine garden. This garden imagery has two sides of prosperity (Eden) and destruction (Sodom).¹⁵⁰ Following Albert Kamp's use of Paul Werth’s text world theory, Jindo identifies the global concept with the world of text, the local one with the world of

¹⁴⁸ Seong-Hyuk Hong, *The Metaphor of Illness and Healing in Hosea and Its Significance in the Socio-economic Context of Eighth-century Israel and Judah* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 133-140.

¹⁴⁹ Job Y. Jindo, *Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered: A Cognitive Approach to Poetic Prophecy in Jeremiah 1-24*, HSM 64 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 49, 81-2. His analysis of destruction of cities in terms of actants in legal settings in Sumerian laments and Hebrew Bible, see, 96-99.

¹⁵⁰ Jindo, *Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered*, 161-2, 8.

characters.¹⁵¹ However, as Paul Korchin points out, Jindo's oversimplification "runs the exegetical risk of reducing complex societal polities to derivatives of a reified mental notion."¹⁵² The horticultural metaphor of divine garden would not be particular for the ancient Israelites (e.g. Dilmun).¹⁵³ Conversely, although monarchic cosmology prevailed universally, its conceptualization would diverge depending on which type of idea someone has (monotheism or polytheism). Furthermore, it is true that Jindo does not want to deal much with the personification of God and city-states (in terms of feminization), personification and metonymy is used in his cosmic legal drama and divine garden model.¹⁵⁴

Isaian literature is full of conceptual metaphors. GOD IS IN THE HIGHWAY metaphor in the transitional chapters (chs. 35 and 40) shows clearly how God is anthropomorphized as one who is standing and who paves his way by UP the valleys and DOWN the mountains. Definitely, we can say that this personification of divine image and its orientational metaphor is based on human body experience. Further, from the reference of valleys and mountains, we can presuppose that this metaphor came from someone's particular geographical surroundings. If you are a *learned* reader on the biblical texts, from the mentioning of divine revenge in 35:4, you can recall similar images how GOD IS THE WARRIOR metaphor is linked with this metaphor to describe theophany such as Exo 15 and Hab 3: YHWH is presented as the warrior who is fighting against Israel's enemy to deliver his people. This personification is rooted in the socio-

¹⁵¹ Jindo, *Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered*, 50, 147.

¹⁵² Paul Korchin, "Book Review: Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered: A Cognitive Approach to Poetic Prophecy in Jeremiah 1-24." in *Hebrew Studies* 54.1 (2013), 424.

¹⁵³ Katharine J. Dell, *The Solomonic Corpus of 'Wisdom' and Its Influence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 196.

¹⁵⁴ Jindo, *Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered*, 135 (footnote, 176).

cultural understanding of the ancient Near Eastern people describing the role of kingship. This understanding is also implied in 35:8 and 40:3 by using the images of cleanliness and straightness. It implies that the royal (pilgrimage) road to going back to the capital with the victorious message. Here we can realize that the GOD IS KING metaphor is the fundamental one to make a bridge between GOD IS IN THE HIGHWAY metaphor and GOD IS THE WARRIOR one.

In sum, we can conclude that first, metaphor in biblical texts is rooted in its experimental understanding of the body and its surroundings. Second, metaphor in biblical texts is not just linked word by word. It is conceptual. Third, metaphor in biblical texts shares a complex worldview of its surrounding cultures.

3.4. The Problem of Ambivalence in Reality

The concept of ambivalence is introduced by Sigmund Freud in his psychoanalytic work *Totem and Taboo* (1913). Freud borrowed this term from German psychologist Eugen Bleuler. He defines ambivalence as “the conflict between these two currents” that “are localized in the subject’s mind in such a manner that they cannot come up against each other.” While the one current of prohibition (taboo) is identified as conscious, the other one of the persistent desire to touch (totemic desire) is unconscious, “the subject knows nothing of it.”¹⁵⁵ The typical Freudian example is the Oedipus complex, which is the unconscious desire of loving the mother and hating the father since the phallic stage of psychosexual development (age three to six years).

¹⁵⁵ Sigmund Freud, *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. Trans. James Strachey (New York: Routledge, 2001), 34-35. First published in German, 1913.

Freud sees that this ambivalent feeling of patricide provokes the formation of religion, morals, society and art.¹⁵⁶ However, this type of analysis focuses too much on personal sexual desire.

Unlike Freud, Carl Jung is more focused on the collective unconscious and its positive aspects. In his later work *Answer to Job* (1952) Jung shows clearly how he practiced his psychoanalysis on his reading of God-the-character (abbr. God here below) in the biblical narrative. His analysis is based on his psychoanalytic view on the human's complex psyche that surrounds the true Self, rather than on any kind of theological logic. According to Jungian analytic psychology, humans have the archetypal shadow in their unconscious that the conscious ego cannot perceive. This shadow could be either negative or positive. In *Answer to Job*, Jung pays particular attention to God's consciousness (good side) and its unconscious shadow (evil side). The event that occurs in which God makes Job suffer because of Satan's deception, it causes God to realize his negative shadow and the necessity of his salvation from human morality as Job shows. The plot of Christ's incarnation and crucifixion is twisted in this psychoanalytic point of view. The problem is, Jung's discussion of God's archetypal shadow (what he calls the fourth aspect of the Trinity) is ambiguous. In the first half, he describes it as a negative shadow (evil side). But at the end of his argument, he turns to see an anima (unconscious feminine side of a man) as the true fourth aspect.¹⁵⁷ In the case of Jung, he takes a position that is relatively in the middle of the road because he opens the possibility of positive

¹⁵⁶ Freud, *Totem and Taboo*, 182.

¹⁵⁷ Carl G. Jung, *Answer to Job*, trans. R. F. C. Hull (New York: Pastoral Psychology Book Club, 1955), First published in German, 1952.

change in God-the-character in the divine drama.¹⁵⁸ In sum, throughout the process of analyzing God-the-character in the divine drama, he wants to tell us the complexity and ambivalence of the human psyche. However, this type of analysis is limited to what occurs within the inner psyche of the human mind; it dismisses the socio-cultural aspect of ambivalence.

Frantz Fanon was a psychiatrist, born in French Martinique in the eastern Caribbean Sea, who had a deep interest in psychopathological problems in colonial society. As a critical response to Octave Manoni's racial bias, he sees that the psychopathological problems that colonized people of color have would not be solved by methodologies suggested by white bourgeoisie in the west. The source of the problem resides in the fact that it is the ambivalence within the colonial mentality that affects the colonized in their socio-economic relation to the colonizer. As we infer from his first book titled *Black Skin, White Mask* in 1952, some colonized black people who are possessed by a sense of inferiority reject their blackness and pursue (mimic) to be whiteness, but finally this mimicry fails because of the reality of skin color.¹⁵⁹ It means that all psychopathological problems are caused by the negative attitude toward skin color within the colonial structure.¹⁶⁰ Even though Fanon is not mentioned, this negative side of the colonial mentality is well described in Steed V. Davidson's comparative reading of chs. 46-51

¹⁵⁸ Contra him, José de Sousa Saramago, in his novel *The Gospel according to Jesus Christ*, 1994 (Originally published in Portuguese in 1991), describes God-the-character as a Machiavellian dictator who justifies his ends by means because of his ambitions and desires for power and fame.

¹⁵⁹ Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin White Mask*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann (London: Pluto Press, 2008), 61-81. Originally published in French in 1952.

¹⁶⁰ Edward W. Said problematizes the westerners' prejudices and ignorance of the other's culture while they see the other as the object of enlightenment. See his *Orientalism*, 1978. However, as Jong-pil Yoon points out, Said's one-sided view on euro-centricism does not see how Asian culture influenced Europeans. Jong-pil Yoon, “에드워드 사이드(Edward Said) 이후의 오리엔탈리즘 연구 동향과 그 세계사 교육적 함의 [An Analysis of the Historical Studies on Orientalism after Edward Said and Their Implications for World History Teaching]” *The Western History Review* 145 (2020), 77-123.

and chs. 42-44 in MT Jeremiah. After reviewing how the oracle against the nations (chs 46-51) serves the imperial agenda, he argues that this reading portrays the Egyptian *she'erit* group as refugees who are excluded by the imperial agenda in favor of the Babylonian *golah* group.¹⁶¹

However, Fanon firmly objects to turning back to any kind of racial supremacy as an alternative to solving the colonial mentality of ambivalence and mimicry because of the danger of the dualistic either-or perspective that he calls Manichaeism. He sees that the Négritude movement, which was led by Aimé Césaire and Léopold Sédar Senghor in the 1930s, has a clear limitation because it is focused too much on highlighting the rediscovery and rivalry of Black African heritage only. Instead, he highlights universal human liberation against all forms of unjust social structures. In his later but controversial work *The Wretched of The Earth* published in 1961, even though he does not justify all kinds of violence, he mentions the inevitability of the use of violence to deconstruct this unjust system.¹⁶² In this vein, Fanon really did participate in the Algerian War to fight for their independence from France. Fanon's socio-economic emphasis is worthwhile but it is limited within the transitional context from the colonial to the decolonial era during the mid-twentieth century.

Like Fanon, Homi K. Bhabha was born and raised in a marginalized middle-class Parsi family in Mumbai, India. Unlike Fanon, he is more concerned with postmodern and poststructural relativism and reception because he was born after the end of the British Raj. In his work *Location of Culture* (1994), he sees that mimicking the colonizer with ambivalent

¹⁶¹ Steed V. Davidson, "The Imperial End: How Empire Overtakes Refugees in Jeremiah" in *Political Theology* 19.6 (2018), 460-77.

¹⁶² Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of The Earth*, foreword by Homi K. Bhabha, trans. Richard Philcox (New York: Grove Press 2004). First published in French, 1961.

feelings is not psychopathological disorder but provides nutrition for cultural production and resistance to create a third space between the colonizer and the colonized.¹⁶³ As Bart Moore-Gilbert points out, he emphasizes “the mutualities and negotiations across the colonial divide.”¹⁶⁴ For Bhabha, it is hard to clearly distinguish the boundaries between the colonizer and the colonized because they reveal not only conflicts and suppressions but also complex dynamics in the colonial relationship which are constructed by forms of multiple and contradictory beliefs: “The fetish or stereotype gives access to an 'identity' which is predicated as much on mastery and pleasure as it is on anxiety and defence, for it is a form of multiple and contradictory beliefs in its recognition of difference and disavowal of it.”¹⁶⁵ In other words, the boundaries between the colonizer and the colonized are blurred. So, mimicry as “almost the same but not quite,” is not

¹⁶³ Homi K. Bhabha defines his third space “where the negotiation of incommensurable differences creates a tension peculiar to borderline existences...But for me the importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original moments from which the third emerges, rather hybridity to me is the ‘third space’ which enables other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through received wisdom” Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 217. Edward Soja, the spatial scholar in Los Angeles, hybridizes Bhabha’s concept of third space with Henry Lefebvre’s spatial theory. By doing this, he suggests the thirdspace as the space that forms hybridizing (interplaying, blending) socio-cultural relationships beyond the physical firstspace and the functional secondspace throughout the process of Thirthing-as-Othering. Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1996); Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1991; Originally published in French in 1974). Jon L. Berquist’s spatial analysis on Jerusalem well shows how this theory works in the biblical studies. He criticizes S. N. Eisenstadt’s notion of Persian Jerusalem as a free-floating resource and then argues that Jerusalem in the fifth century functioned as the space for pilgrimages which is a space where pilgrims gathered to share public memory and identity. Jon L. Berquist, “Spaces of Jerusalem,” in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*, ed. Claudia V. Camp and Jon L. Berquist (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 40-52.

¹⁶⁴ Bart Moore-Gilbert, *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics* (London: Verso, 1997), 115.

¹⁶⁵ Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 75.

considered just a matter of passive obedience and copy-and-paste, but should be evaluated as active subversive creation by hybridizing both one and the other.¹⁶⁶

In sum, Bhabhaian logic of cultural ambivalence and following hybridization is about both/and not either/or or neither/nor. It is more closely related to our understanding of an active sense of redaction, rereading, reinterpretation, and reception in biblical scholarship. Asian American biblical scholars redefine Bhabha's ideas in terms of the ancient Chinese philosophical notion of *yin* and *yang*. Andrew Yueking Lee reveals typical or traditional understandings of *yinyang*. He defines *yinyang* as "complementary dualism within relationships."¹⁶⁷ This "both-and" understanding can also be found in Hyun-Chul Paul Kim.¹⁶⁸ He considers *yinyang* as a reciprocal, harmonized, complementary concept in paradox rather than in contradiction and reduction. However, Tat Siong Benny Liew disagrees with this "both-and" understanding of *yinyang*.¹⁶⁹ Following Amy Tan's idea of "Yin Eyes" in *The Hundred Secret Senses* (1995), he attempts, rather, to understand *yinyang* as contradictory. From his his double-edged attitude about the Bible as a source of both liberation and oppression, he argues that reading with *yinyang* eyes means that it is necessary to read from the margins in order to criticize oppressive powers

¹⁶⁶ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 89; "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse" in *October* 28 (1984), 125-133. Following the Bhabhaian view, Tae Woong Lee focuses on how main characters backlash against dominant power by hybridizing both Jewish and imperial cultures in Daniel 1-6. *The Resistance of Daniel and His Friend: A Postcolonial Satirical Reading of Daniel 1-6 in Its Sociopolitical Context* (PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2017). See also, Timothy L. Seals, *Daniel's Mystic Third Space: A Postcolonial Mysticism* (PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2019).

¹⁶⁷ Andrew Yueking Lee, "Reading the Bible as an Asian American: Issues in Asian American Biblical Interpretation," in *Ways of Being, Ways of Reading: Asian American Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Mary F. Foskett and Jeffrey Kah-Jin Kuan (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2006), 63.

¹⁶⁸ Hyun-Chul Paul Kim, "Interpretive Modes of Yin-Yang Dynamics as Asian Hermeneutics," *BibInt* 9 (2001), 287-308; Kim, *Reading Isaiah*, 19.

¹⁶⁹ Tat-siong Benny Liew, *What Is Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics? Reading the New Testament* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008), 26.

and create solidarity that can speak back to the dominant culture.¹⁷⁰ That is why he turns his questions from “who” and “what” to “how” in terms of the invention of tradition. Then he attempts “to legitimize Asian American biblical hermeneutics through an inventive tradition of citation, or of reference without referentiality.”¹⁷¹ Even the concept of *yinyang* is totally rejected by Gale Yee’s provocative article “*Yin/Yang Is Not Me*.” In telling about her dual experience in America and in Hong Kong as a Chinese American, she realizes that she “remains an oddity in both contexts.” Following Web Du Bois’s sketch on Black theater, she sketched briefly the future goals of Asian Americans through lenses of heterogeneity, hybridity and multiplicity.¹⁷² In other words, even though she admits that she has experienced Bhabhaian ambivalence and hybridization throughout her whole life, it could not be articulated in one specific cultural term like *yinyang*. She seems to disagree with types of established hegemony like nationalism and nativism and seeks to discover more inclusive space in the political reality. The typical example of Bhabhaian Asian American reading of biblical texts is Uriah Kim’s reconstruction of King David. While he defends Josiah’s liminality against Samaritans’ hybridity in his first work, he describes David as one who was pursuing hybridization with a manner of hesed/*jeong* while disagreeing with Saul’s ethnocentric nativism although David’s Machiavellianism.¹⁷³

¹⁷⁰ Liew, *What Is Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics?*, 23.

¹⁷¹ Liew, *What Is Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics?*, 7.

¹⁷² Gale A. Yee, “Yin/Yang Is Not Me: An Exploration into an Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics,” in *Ways of Being, Ways of Reading*, 152-163.

¹⁷³ Uriah Y. Kim. *Identity and Loyalty in the David Story: A Postcolonial Reading, Hebrew Bible Monographs 22* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008), 149-150, 158-9. His use of the Korean term *Jeong* (정, 情, affection-and-kindness) is relying on Wonhee Anne Joh’s theological definition. See, Wonhee Anne Joh, *Heart of the Cross: A Postcolonial Christology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006).

If the cultural ambivalence and following hybridity become alternative ways of counter-cultural resistance against the dominant culture, it is necessary that they be backed up by socio-economic capitals. Bhabhaian discourse focuses only on creativity and productiveness that result when two different cultures encounter each other; it ignores the problem of social structure, which Fanon actually points out. In this respect, the Subaltern Studies Group, started by Ranajit Guha and continued by later scholars, focuses more on the inner socio-cultural conflicts in postcolonial society and tries to represent the marginalized voice of the lower social classes in the South Asian context.¹⁷⁴ For example, even though it addresses only the Southeast Asian context, James C. Scotts in his earlier works (1985, 1990) focuses on how subaltern peasant groups are actively conducting and expressing their resistance in various infrapolitical forms symbolically every day (hidden transcript) against conventional bourgeoisie hegemony (public transcript).¹⁷⁵ However, the main problem of subaltern studies is, as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak

¹⁷⁴ Ranajit Guha, in his work *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999; Originally published in Delhi, 1983), See also, following Guha's definition of subaltern, Yoon Kyung Kim read minor character as subordinated subaltern character under the major character. *Subaltern Characters: Agents for Social Change in 2 Kings 7:1-20* (PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2018). Aligned with Guha, Dipesh Chakrabarty goes further to problematize Eurocentric "universal history" to pursue "phantom-like" objectivity. Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); "A Small History of Subaltern Studies," in *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, ed. Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 467-487. Uriah Y. Kim's postcolonial criticism of Nothian DtrH is dependent on Chakrabarty's "a history of their own." *Decolonizing Josiah: Toward a Postcolonial Reading of the Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005).

¹⁷⁵ "Here I have in mind the ordinary weapons of relatively powerless groups: foot dragging, dissimulation, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, sabotage, and so forth." James C. Scott, *Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 29; *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 1-16. See also, Richard A. Horsely, ed. *Hidden Transcripts and The Arts of Resistance: Applying the Works of James C. Scott to Jesus and Paul*, ed. Richard A. Horsley (Boston: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004). Inchol Yang is reading the Tyrian oracle in Ezek 27-28 as a hidden polemic against Neo-Babylonian Empire. *Ezekiel's Prophecies under the Influence of Mesopotamian Literature: Hidden Transcripts against Empire* (PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2019). Sunghwan Lee's approach on

skeptically questions in “Can the Subaltern Speak?”, in the intellectuals themselves since they are trying to represent the voice of the voiceless subaltern (in the case of Spivak, it is women who belong to low castes).¹⁷⁶ Therefore it does not matter what the research is reaching toward (etic) or into (emic).¹⁷⁷ What does matter is who monopolizes the voice according to Spivak. In this vein, John Beverley rightly summarizes her thesis: “If the subaltern could speak—that is, speak in a way that really mattered to us—then it wouldn't be subaltern.”¹⁷⁸ Spivak’s perspective is based on the long-transmitted hereditary caste system in particular. This is contrary to how *ssi-al* or *minjung* are viewed as an active collective and public subject of history within South Korean history.¹⁷⁹ It is necessary to take into careful consideration the particularity of time and space even when we discuss postcolonial phenomena. We have some cases of minor characters speaking up and even talking back in biblical narratives. As Spivak points out, this voice would be the construction represented (and projected) by those ancient intellectuals who can read and write. So, in most cases in biblical texts, as Spivak points out, it is hard to hear from socio-

Mark 7:1-23 also is in this way. Sunghwan Lee, *Who Were the Pharisees Again, Hidden Polemic in Mark 7:1-23* (PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2019).

¹⁷⁶ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Can the Subaltern Speak?”, *Wedge* 7-8 (1985), 120-30.

¹⁷⁷ Concerning more methodological discussion on emic and etic, read Marvin Harris, *Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for a Science of Culture* (New York: Random House, 1979), 32-45.

¹⁷⁸ John Beverley, *Subalternity and Representation: Arguments in Cultural Theory* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999), 1.

¹⁷⁹ The concept *ssi-al* (national subject) was introduced as a philosophical and spiritual concept by Young-Mo Ryu (1890-1981). Sok-hon Ham (1901-1989), Quaker theologian, developed this concept into a socio-historical and national horizon. For Ham, *ssi-al* is equated with *minjung*. Ham Sok Hon, *Queen of Suffering: A Spiritual History of Korea*. trans. E. Sang Yu (London: Friends World Committee for Consultation, 1985). However, recent theologians are trying to make a bridge between *minjung* and subaltern. Eleazar S. Fernandez, “Empire, Global Hegemony, and the Theo-Political Practice of the Subaltern *Minjung*,” in *Minjung Theology Today: Contextual and Intercultural Perspectives*, ed. Jin-Kwan Kwon and Volker Küster (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2018), 205-220.

economically subordinated characters regardless of racial and gender identity. In other words, representation is another word for projection.

Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses* (1988) well describes the *inner struggle* of hybridized characters within the modern context of postcolonial immigration.¹⁸⁰ One protagonist is Gibreel Farishta, the atheist Bollywood actor who plays Hindu gods. He hates western culture but his lover is Alleluia Cone, British-Jewish mountain climber who has a white skin. The other protagonist is Saladin Chamcha, who hates all things from India, but then pursues becoming a perfect British man. At first glance, these people look like the stereotypical characters that Bhabha describes. However, after the plane incident with terrorists, their lives go through enormous changes and their dreams clash with reality. The first character suffers from schizophrenia, the latter is having trouble with discrimination in British society. The end of the plot is even more ambivalent: somewhat catastrophic (against the external dominant culture), somewhat conciliatory (with the internal home culture).¹⁸¹ This conclusion is not about Fanon's philanthropic solidarity fight against an unjust regime, and Bhabha's cultural resistance throughout the process of hybridization. Furthermore, these voices are not representative of subalterns, but of middle-class diasporic immigrants

During the late sixth century B.C.E., Yehud was a colonial space under the rule of the Persian Empire. Also it was the land of their ancestors and the space of immigration, to which

¹⁸⁰ Salman Rushdie, *Satanic Verses: A Novel* (New York: Picador, 1988).

¹⁸¹ Hasan Saeed Majed read Rushdie's characterization in light of binary between Islam and secularism/atheism. He argues that, while agreeing with Richard Lane and Stephan Morton's criticism, even though Rushdie calls himself a postcolonial writer, he fails to see colonial discourses in Muslim experience because of his strong belief in secularism. Hasan Saeed Majed, *Islamic Postcolonialism: Islam and Muslim Identities in Four Contemporary British Novels* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), 11, 34, 49.

the second and third generations of Babylonian deportees were returning. We can presuppose that they were already baptized by Bhabhaic colonial mimicry and hybridization after their exilic period in Babylon. Even though they had a hard time with imperial oppression (Ps 137:1-4), they were able to accommodate and transhape the dominant culture into their own ways. For example, Ezekiel's imagined temple is very similar to the Babylonian ziggurat Etemenanki.¹⁸² Also, the use of the Babylonian calendar system (e.g. Nisan in Neh 2:1; Esth 3:7) was prevalent in mid fifth century B.C.E.

In fact, it was the imperial policy in the ancient Near East to show off conquering monarchs and to collect tributes and taxes throughout the suzerainty system. It is not like a modern understanding of imperialism, which is to expand territory, settle a clear borderline, and spread knowledge and propaganda to enlighten the others while exploiting them militarily. Antiochus IV Euphrosyne's hellenization program would be close to this type. As Ariel M. Bagg points out on the case of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, even though it successfully crosses the Augustan threshold (passing the critical transition from the expansion phase into the consolidation phase), this Empire shows "no civilizing pretensions" because of lack of infrastructural investments or programmatic acculturation program.¹⁸³ During the short rule of the Neo-Babylonian Empire and following the dominance of the Persian Empire, there was no such civilization program. In Southern Mesopotamia and Upper Egypt, Diasporic Jews lived

¹⁸² Steven L. Cook, *Ezekiel 38-48: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 22B (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), 14.

¹⁸³ Ariel M. Bagg, "Palestine under Assyrian Rule: A New Look at the Assyrian Imperial Policy in the West" in *JAOS* 133.1 (2013), 131.

together and preserved their religious identity, even though it represented a hybridized form, they worked with rulers and traders there.

Achaemenid Persia also admitted cultural diversity under political control and even encouraged subjects to build a sanctuary and codify a canon for their deities (e.g. Udjahorresnet). All policies and practices in Yehud government, as the subprovince of the Ebernari satrap, were under political control of imperial governance. Following Immanuel Wallerstein's world system theory on international relations, Berquist analyzes the geo-political location of Yehud that functioned as a semi-peripheral middle-class state between the wealthy core and the poor periphery in terms that reflected an imperial system (for contemporary examples, think of South Korea, Taiwan, Mexico, and etc.).

This provides a most helpful way to understand Jerusalem's role as a center of colonial administration within the Persian Empire. Although Jerusalem was far from the imperial core and exhibited markedly different organization forms in comparison to the Persian capital cities it was distinct from the rural areas of the periphery itself. Also, core-periphery meditation quite aptly describes the functions of the Jerusalem elite as they administered imperial policy. Chase-Dunn and Hall note that semiperipheral regions are often "unusually fertile zones for social innovation" because of their in-between status.¹⁸⁴

In the postexilic space of Yehud, the returnees served as political and religious representatives for both the Persian administration and Yehud society.¹⁸⁵ They were sharing collective memories, what had been transmitted to them from their predecessors, as oral and written forms. The problem is, these small elite immigrant groups considered themselves, having

¹⁸⁴ Jon L. Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow: A Social and Historical Approach* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2003: originally published in 1995), 246.

¹⁸⁵ It is hard to be supported by the hypothetical messianic revival movement of the Davidic monarchy to explain the sudden dismissal of Zerubbabel ben Shealtiel because of the lack of textual and historical evidence.

Deutero-Isaianic hope, as remnants (*she'erits*) to recover the devastated empty homeland. The truth is people continued to live in that land. The theological problem of salvation delay and any following conflicts were caused by this encounter with the natives, including not only those who remained after the fall of Jerusalem, but also various social groups, mixed-blood, and gentiles. We can say that these latter groups were voiceless subalterns.¹⁸⁶ A typical example of this category is the hybridized residents in Samaria after 722.¹⁸⁷ Analyzing how the ingroup (Yehud) forms its social identity by comparing, competing, and conflicting with the outgroup (Edom). Dominic S. Irudayaraj's statement well shows Trito-Isaiah's geopolitical reality; "If so, the Yehud community, with its colonial memory but now under the shadows of the Persian Empire, seems to be turning its gaze not on the dominant 'other' but on the proximate 'other.'" Within this complex socio-cultural context, it is necessary to revisit these internal factors within the Yehud society in relation to Persian imperial governance when we are reviewing thematic differences between the core and bookend of Trito-Isaiah.

Reading thematic differences in relation to ambivalence can be understood in light of cognitive dissonance. Robert P. Carroll, relying on Leon Festinger's 1957 theory of cognitive

¹⁸⁶ In his reading of Isa 63:1-6, Dominic S. Irudayaraj sees how Trito-Isaiah, as one of the marginalized returnees, objectifies Edom as the proximate other while keeping distance from Perisa the dominant other. Dominic S. Irudayaraj, *Violence, Otherness and Identity in Isaiah 63:1-6: The Trampling One Coming from Edom* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 67-89. However, as Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer and Andrew T. Abernethy point out, there is not enough discussion about the role of Edom as the proximate other in the textual and historical setting. See, Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer's review in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 63.2 (2018), 507-509 and Andrew T. Abernethy's review in *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 29.1 (2019), 91-93. Another example of social identity reading, Hyun-Ho Park, *Breaking the Vicious Cycle of Slander, Labeling and Violence: Intergroup Conflict, Recategorization, and Identity Construction in Acts 21:17-23:35* (PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2019).

¹⁸⁷ Uriah Y. Kim, *Decolonizing Josiah: Toward a Postcolonial Reading of the Deuteronomistic History*, Bible in the Modern World 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005), 180.

dissonance on the belief disconfirmation,¹⁸⁸ deals with the problems of inconsistency within biblical prophetic discourses in his *When Prophecy Failed*, written in 1979. Leon Festinger, Henry W. Riecken, and Stanley Schachter's *When Prophecy Fails*, written in 1956, provides fine emic analysis on the Seekers, the apocalyptic rapturists in Chicago, how they rationalized to reduce disconfirmation between their failed expectation and reality.¹⁸⁹

The person may try to change one or more of the beliefs, opinions, or behaviors involved in the dissonance; to acquire new information or beliefs that will increase the existing consonance and thus cause the total dissonance to be reduced; or to forget or reduce the importance of those cognitions that are in a dissonant relationship.¹⁹⁰

Especially, within the exclusive ingroup that has a certain religious fervor (like the case of the Seekers in 1950s), for reducing and fixing their disconfirmation, they follow these five conditions that rationalize their belief system and consolidate their group. Lorne L. Dawson well summarizes this defense mechanism of post-decision: "(1) a belief must be held with 'deep conviction' and have an impact on people's behavior; (2) the conviction must lead to important actions that are 'difficult to undo'; (3) the belief must be 'sufficiently specific' so that 'events

¹⁸⁸ As Judson Mills cites, when Festinger presents his retrospect related to his cognitive dissonance theory thirty years before in 1987, he confessed that he "left and stopped doing research on the theory of dissonance because I was in a total rut." Even though he had not done that much since 1964, he was encouraged to continue to improve this theory, "I am quite sure that there is enough validity to the theory, and as changes are made, emendations are made, there will be even more validity to the theory, that research on it will continue, and a lot will get clarified" Judson Mills, "Improving the 1957 Version of Dissonance Theory" in *Cognitive Dissonance: Reexamining a Pivotal Theory in Psychology*, second edition. ed. Eddie Harmon-Jones (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1999), 32-43 (Apple Books).

¹⁸⁹ According to Eddie Harmon-Jones and Judson Mills, there are four research paradigms related to people's experience of cognitive dissonance: 1) free choice; 2) belief disconfirmation; 3) effort justification; and 4) induced compliance. Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter (1956) belong to the second paradigm. Eddie Harmon-Jones and Judson Mills, "An Introduction to Cognitive Dissonance Theory and an Overview of Current Perspectives on the Theory" in *Cognitive Dissonance*, second edition, 84-85 (Apple Books).

¹⁹⁰ Leon Festinger, Henry W. Riecken, and Stanley Schachter, *When Prophecy Fails: A Social and Psychological Study of A Modern Group that Predicted the Destruction of the World* (New York: Harper & Row, 1956), 20.

may unequivocally refute [it]'; (4) this 'disconfirmatory evidence must be recognized'; (5) the believer must have the 'social support' of fellow believers."¹⁹¹ It is true that, as a learned reader, we can perceive such dissonance when we are reading prophetic literature because of the textual inconsistencies. Carroll's comparison between Isa 1:16-19, 27 and 6:9-13 is a good example. He presupposes that, after the prophet failed to persuade King Ahaz (7:12), Isaiah withdrew his mind of calling for national change and as a result became more interested using in his sympathetic supporters to consolidate his belief system (8:16).¹⁹² Although this example shows how the theory applies to the case of the one individual character, it does not mean he denies the Isaian texts which "are far too complex and diversified to allow for a simple formulation"¹⁹³ Therefore, Carroll is more interested in applying this theory in the manner of a hermeneutic principle as part of postdecision making, instead of using psychoanalytic analysis as a result of an unfulfilled prophecy.¹⁹⁴ In other words, the problem of salvation delay is not a matter of social

¹⁹¹ Lorne L. Dawson, "Prophetic Failure in Millennial Movements" in *The Oxford Handbook of Millennialism*. Catherine Wessinger. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 156; Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter, *When Prophecy Fails* (New York: Harper & Row, 1956), 4.

¹⁹² Robert P. Carroll, "Ancient Israelite Prophecy and Dissonance Theory" in *Numen* 24.2 (1977), 144.

¹⁹³ I recited from Carroll, "Ancient Israelite Prophecy", 145. Originally from Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* (London: SCM Press, 1967), 120.

¹⁹⁴ In fact, Carroll, in his 1977 article, sees that the two motifs of repentance and remnant in the ancient religion make it difficult to apply the theory because it removes the possibility of falsification (esp, Jer 18:7-10; also examples of King Hezekiah and Manasseh) and protects from total disintegration: "In practical terms the concepts of repentance and remnants expose the inadequacy of dissonance theory for dealing with the complex notions involved in prophecy. No prediction need ever fail because the repentance principle creates sufficient space for it to be modified in accordance with human behavior." See, Carroll, "Ancient Israelite Prophecy," 118. However, this view is switched in his article three year later. While he still admitted the complexity of repentance in the Hebrew Bible, he considered that repentance to be the post-decisional response of failed prophecy: "Whatever the background and range of the prophetic idea of repentance may have been it is clear it complicates any simple paradigm of prediction-fulfillment. As used by the deuteronomy historians the motif of repentance became a mechanical device for adjusting the record in accordance with fixed beliefs." Robert P. Carroll, "Prophecy and Dissonance: A Theoretical Approach to the Prophetic Tradition" in *ZAW* 92 (1980), 115.

conflict but is the starting point of rereading, reinterpretation, and reframing (rationalization) by certain interpretive communities who share ritual, eschatological, and apocalyptic ideas (exclusive social support groups who align with prophet and prophetic tradition). In this respect, he continues,

The attachment of Is 40-55 and Is 56-66 to Is 1-39 are also part of the process of reinterpreting the prophetic tradition to make it relevant to each generation and to modify or expand it in accordance with the changing fortune of history. This interpretive and transformational process may be seen as evidence for the principle *dissonance gives rise to hermeneutic*. Eventually prophecy was transformed by apocalyptic which became yet another attempt to show how unfulfilled expectations must of necessity be released. All of these elements confirm the hermeneutical response to the experience of dissonance.¹⁹⁵

Like this, Carroll has interest in the interpretive roles of apocalyptic communities as a post-decisional response to their dissonance.¹⁹⁶ It is true that he is generally aligned with Hanson's theory of the rise of apocalypticism from prophetic tradition in light of cognitive dissonance theory, but he does not agree with Hanson's radical sectarian distinctions between what is ideological and utopian.¹⁹⁷ From this point of view, Cook is half right and half wrong. He is right when he says that Hanson's theory on apocalypticism "seems to adopt a cognitive dissonance approach" although he does not bring in Festinger directly. He is wrong when he says, "In his (Carroll's) view postexilic deprivation accompanied by a collapse of prophetic hopes gave rise to dissonance (parenthesis is mine)" because Carroll never fuses social

¹⁹⁵ Robert P. Carroll, "Prophecy and Dissonance" in *ZAW* 92 (1980), 118.

¹⁹⁶ "With its roots in prophecy apocalyptic became the resolution of the dissonance caused by the lack of fulfillment of prophecy in the early post-exilic period." Robert P. Carroll, *When Prophecy Failed: Cognitive Dissonance in the Prophetic Traditions of the Old Testament* (New York: The Seabury Press 1979), 205.

¹⁹⁷ Robert P. Carroll, *When Prophecy Failed*, 210.

deprivation with cognitive dissonance.¹⁹⁸ Nevertheless, Cook rightly points out that cognitive dissonance would not be experienced by peripheral groups who are socially deprived but the central groups also experience that kind of ambivalent feeling.¹⁹⁹

During the late sixth century B.C.E, the cognitive dissonance within the Yehud society arose because of the promised salvation proposed by Deutero-Isaiah. It is about the problem of hermeneutics between ideals and reality. The returnees tried to transplant what they learned in Babylon into Yehud society. For Yehud residents, they needed to be acculturated or excluded under the new social system of rules. Interestingly, Trito-Isaiah's message seems to serve both interests. In the core section (chs. 60-62), the Deutero-Isaianic expectation of returnees is well described. On the contrary, in the bookend (chs. 56 and 65-66), it is highlighted that God finds pious people regardless of any space and identity. This reveals Trito-Isaiah's political ambivalence on his ingroup (returnees) and outgroup (non-returnees).

Let us go back to Lakoff again. In the previous subsection above, we have learned there is no pure enlightenment reason but the real reason is actually interworking with human embodied experience. In this respect, we realize that our language experience and following metaphorical expression also are partially related with our embodied and cultural experience. In this experimental perspective, there is no one who has central models of political idealism, whether or not it is conservative or progressive, that its means and ends are identical. In other words, there is no absolute moderate which is standing in between as a middle of the mathematical scale. People are partially conservative, partially progressive. In other words,

¹⁹⁸ Stephen L. Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995), 15.

¹⁹⁹ Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism*, 57, 214.

Lakoff argues that it is necessary to admit that most people can be considered *biconceptuals*, capable of contradictory political concepts which are rooted in two different family models (The Nation As Family Metaphor): a (conservative) strict father model and a (progressive) nurturant parent model. Regardless of any logical contradiction between two different concepts, the two are experienced side by side unconsciously in our brain: “Both can exist side by side, each neurally inhibiting the other and structuring different areas of experience.”²⁰⁰ So the coexistence with logical contradiction, whether or not we call it ambivalence, inconsistency, disconfirmation, dissonance, and etc, is very natural according to Lakoff. People have multiple variations with different means and different ends based on family-based moral systems: “Liberal” and “conservative” are not just political categories. They are categories whose central members are defined by family-based moral systems that are projected by the Nation As Family metaphor onto the domain of politics. The categories are then extended in the way categories usually are—by variations on the central models that define noncentral subcategories.²⁰¹ This would be categorized by such parameters as 1) linear scales; 2) pragmatic-idealistic dimension; and 3) moral focus.²⁰² First, depending on how one views a certain topic (i.e. punishment, protection) at a certain level, its political type is differentiated. Second, pragmatics use political ideals as means while pursuing self-interest in the end. But idealists do not. Third, depending on how one focuses, the form of political understanding would be differentiated. For example, if a liberal

²⁰⁰ George Lakoff, *Thinking Points: Communicating Our American Values and Vision: A Progressive's Handbook* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008), 15.

²⁰¹ Lakoff, *Moral Politics*, 196, 546. (Apple Books)

²⁰² Lakoff, *Moral Politics*, 196, 504, 546. (Apple Books) I will skip over his discussion of the presence or absence of particular “clauses” in the moral order metaphor because his discussion is too much dependent on already given catchphrases, not conceptual structure behind.

focuses on the individual's right, it would be rights based-liberalism. However, this would contradict the beliefs of those who hold communitarian-liberalism that focuses on social responsibility.²⁰³

The purpose of Lakoff's project is to discuss framing strategies to persuade biconceptual audiences via public communications. In his work *Don't Think of an Elephant!:* (2005), if one intends to pursue an effort to persuade others with a particular political goal, it is important that one not use or even think of the opponent's language because "the words draw you into their worldview...[and] framing is about getting language that fits your worldview."²⁰⁴ If we are continuously attacking the opponent's frame with their language, it creates the opposite effect because it "reinforces their message." So, Lakoff suggests that it is important "to frame our own values, vision, and mission, and avoid attacking theirs, because if we do, it only keeps their ideas in the forefront."²⁰⁵

If we assume that the parts are not relevant to each other because each functions as an independent source, the problem of inconsistency is easily solved. The underlying idea of this approach is based on the Cartesian trust in human reason as it was even in ancient times. The contradictions in the text would not have been allowed, if we imagine the hypothetical ancient writer as one who had an impeccable sense of logical knowledge and literary artistry. If those contradictions were intentionally allowed, it is possible to doubt the propagandistic strategy

²⁰³ Lakoff, *Moral Politics*, 513-4. (Apple Books)

²⁰⁴ George Lakoff, *Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debates* (Chelsea Green Publishing, 2004), 4.

²⁰⁵ Lakoff, *Don't Think of an Elephant!*, xiii.

behind the text, as George Orwell has expressed his doubts about it.²⁰⁶ However, as Lakoff and Johnson rightly point out, human metaphorical expression manifests its embodied experience through our bodies and culture.

Language gets its power because it is defined relative to frames, prototypes, metaphors, narratives, images, and emotions. Part of its power comes from its unconscious aspects: we are not consciously aware of all that it evokes in us, but it is there, hidden, always at work. If we hear the same language over and over, we will think more and more in terms of the frames and metaphors activated by that language. And it doesn't matter if you are negating words or questioning them, the same frames and metaphors will be activated and hence strengthened.²⁰⁷

In this respect, he observes Bush's reframing strategy, for example, to dub pro-industrial programs with pro-environmental naming like *The Clear Skies Initiative*. Then he calls it the Orwellian language, which means "the opposite of what it says—to appease people in the middle at the same time as you pump up the base."²⁰⁸ As Lakoff well knows, the learned audience hates this rhetoric of deception. George Orwell, in his novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, describes how English Socialism (Ingsoc) creates newspeak to manipulate and control people to accept two contradictory concepts, which is called "doublethink." However, it is necessary to take note that Lakoff, though he admits that he was a big fan of Orwell, argues that this author falls into so-

²⁰⁶ "To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them, to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to believe that democracy was impossible and that the Party was the guardian of democracy, to forget whatever it was necessary to forget, then to draw it back into memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly to forget it again, and above all, to apply the same process to the process itself—that was the ultimate subtlety: consciously to induce unconsciousness, and then, once again, to become unconscious of the act of hypnosis you had just performed. Even to understand the word—doublethink—involved the use of doublethink." George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Australia, [first published 1949]), 44-45, <https://www.planetebook.com/free-ebooks/1984.pdf>.

²⁰⁷ George Lakoff, *Political Mind: A Cognitive Scientist's Guide to Your Brain and Its Politics* (New York: Viking, 2009), 15.

²⁰⁸ Lakoff, *Don't Think of an Elephant!*, 22.

called “editor’s fallacy” because his views on language are based on traditional enlightenment reasons. He continues, “Even you, dear reader, may have fallen into them. And even I am trying to cure ignorance via truths conveyed in good prose. I am banking on cognitive dissonance—yours! Dissonance between the real brain and the apparent mind. Intellectuals are confident they know their own minds, though they realize they don’t know their own brains. But their brains betray their confidence in their minds.”²⁰⁹ So, even though Steven Pinker pejoratively names Lakoff’s strategy as “Orwellian advice” to progressives, it is based on Lakoff’s reevaluation of Orwellian language in light of experimental and neurological understanding of embodied reason.²¹⁰

3.5. Closing Remarks

Whether or not one who follows the Duhmian classification of Trito-Isaiah, the last eleven chapters of the Book of Isaiah are still controversial texts within Isaian scholarship because of their ambiguity. Most view Trito-Isaiah as continuing the previous (or following) Isaianic traditions to solve this problem and read it as a logically coherent text. Theories have diverged in many details, but it is hard to renounce the complementary nature within the final form structure of the Book of Isaiah.

Nevertheless, as Lakoff-Johnson points out, there is no Cartesian Enlightenment reason, universal, rational, and value-neutral, in our reality. Our metaphoric language in the real world is

²⁰⁹ Lakoff, “What Orwell Didn’t Know About the Brain, the Mind, and Language” in *What Orwell Didn’t Know: Propaganda and the New Face of American Politics*, András Szántó, ed. (New York: Public Affairs, 2007), 68.

²¹⁰ Steven Pinker, *The Stuff of Thought: Language as a Window into Human Nature* (New York: Viking, 2007), 259-60.

manifested throughout our experience around our body and culture. With this reconsideration of our embodied cognition, I would like to suggest that it is necessary to reframe the ambiguous nature of so-called Trito-Isaiah from different angles. What if ambiguity within Trito-Isaiah is not caused by other scribal communities in different times and spaces, but by a single writer who belongs to an interpretive community (or -ies) in Persian Yehud sharing collective memories of remembering the past and recirculating it (as embodied and enculturated forms) within the present? If so, it is necessary to reevaluate this writer's social location and his messages, not only religious but also socio-political.

The next chapter will examine how the socio-historical context of Trito-Isaiah would be reconstructed in relation to the brief investigation of the Achaemenid Empire under the reign from Cyrus II to Artaxerxes I. Reconsidering history is very important in the effort to locate Trito-Isaiah and review his ambivalence within the socio-cultural context of Persian Yehud.

Chapter Four

Socio-Historical Reconstruction of Persian Yehud

The main interest in this chapter is the socio-historical reconstruction of earlier post-exilic Yehud under the rule of the Persian Empire in relation to revisiting Trito-Isaiah. So, our historical review does not go beyond the mid-fifth century B.C.E. As we discussed above in Chapter Two, some scholars suggest putting a later date in some parts of Trito-Isaiah: Xerxes I (Morgenstern), Artaxerxes III Ochus (Cheyne), Ptolemaic period (Steck), and Hellenistic period (Volz). However, these later dates are too far from what Trito-Isaiah implies. Even though they allegorically place what the text describes into certain historical events, the text is not consistent with other literature in that time period. The threat and crisis against the pious group of YHWH-believers is the main topic of Trito-Isaiah, but it is necessary to take care when we decide who is responsible for this crisis. Unlike Ben Sira, First and Second Maccabees, we do not hear a call to preserve their national identity as Jews from any clear external cultural threat. Further, if we presuppose that influence from Hellenistic influences in Trito-Isaiah, whether or not it comes from the Ptolemaic or Seleucid Empire, we do not see any trajectory of philosophical conversation with Platonism and Stoicism like Philo of Alexandria and the author of the Wisdom of Solomon. In this respect, the Hellenistic dating would not be accurate in this paper.

The reconstruction of Persian history is a very difficult project because of the lack of information of Persian literary sources. Besides scant artifacts, iconographies, coins, inscriptions (i.e. Behistun), most sources we have that are related to this period are secondary from Greek

literature and historiography (Herodotus, Xenophon, Ctesias, etc.) and Hebrew literature (postexilic literature in the Hebrew Bible, Josephus). This source imbalance results in a biased understanding of “Persia” in the western and even westernized world. To overcome this, modern scholars have tried to reconstruct and rewrite the “History of Persia.” Albert T. Olmstead’s work in 1948 reconstructs it based on its chronological order in relation to main achievements and failures.¹ For several decades, Olmstead’s *History* has held the position as the standard for historiography. However, as Muhammad A. Dandamaev points out, it has been “subsequently repeatedly reprinted without alteration” even though “thousands of written sources have been brought into scholarly circulation since Olmstead’s book first appeared.”² In this respect, this Lak-Russian scholar does review both archeological and hermeneutical resources with socio-cultural consideration of the periods from the seventh to the fourth centuries B.C.E.³ Regrettably, after the Iranian Revolution in 1976, most of the research on ancient Iran had to be done selectively: “Sources and literature which were published before the end of 1976 and were accessible to the authors have been utilized extensively, but it has been possible to consider later materials selectively.”⁴ Despite those difficulties, Pierre Briant published his groundbreaking historiography in French, in 1996. Following the methodology of the *Annales* school, he focuses

¹ Interestingly, Olmstead spent one chapter on Zoroaster between Cambyses and Darius. See table of contents in Albert T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), xvii.

² Muhammad A. Dandamaev and Vladimir G. Lukonin, *The Culture and Social Institution of Ancient Iran*, trans. Philip L. Kohl and D. J. Dadson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), xiv. This is a revised and updated version of Lukonin’s 1980 work.

³ Muhammad A. Dandamaev, *Slavery in Babylonia: From Nabopolassar to Alexander the Great (626-331 BC)*, revised edition, trans. Victoria A. Powell, ed. Marvin A. Powell and David B. Weisberg (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1984; originally published in Russian in 1974); Muhammad A. Dandamaev, *A Political History of the Achaemenid Empire*, trans. W. J. Vogelsang (Leiden: Brill, 1989; originally published in Russian in 1985).

⁴ Dandamaev and Lukonin, *The Culture and Social Institution*, xv.

on the process of *longue durée* that took place in the history of Achaemenid Persia.⁵ With detailed observation with first and secondary sources, he tries to reconstruct various sociological and economical factors behind particular historiographical descriptions and statements. Unlike Olmstead, even though he follows chronological order when he describes what was happening before and after Darius I, he is digging deeply to describe in detail the socio-economical aspects under the reign of Darius I (Briant spends ten chapters on Darius).⁶

The three historians (Olmstead, Dandamaev, and Briant) have some agreement in relation to postexilic Yehud. First, Yehud functioned as a subprovince of the strap Eber-Nari. (before 486, Babylon and Eber-Nari belonged to one strapal jurisdiction). Second, Sheshbazzar arrived first, then Zerubbabel later during the reign of Darius I. They generally agree that the editor of Ezra describes Sheshbazzar as one who has a royal heritage (he is a prince). Third, Ezra arrived first in 458, then Nehemiah in 445 under the reign of Artaxerxes I.

4.1. Cyrus II (r. 560-530)

4.1.1. Early Life

Cyrus II was born into the Teispids royal family (also into the clan of Achaemenid), which ruled over Anshan, a city-state located in the southeastern part of the Elamite kingdom, settled in the southern Zagros mountains.⁷ His father was Cambyses I, and his genealogy goes

⁵ Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*, trans. Peter T. Daniels (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002; originally published in French, 1996), 9.

⁶ See Table of Contents in Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, vii-x.

⁷ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 18-19, 92.

back Cyrus II-Cambyses I-Cyrus I-Teispes, according to the Cyrus Cylinder.⁸ He became a King of Anshan in 560/59. However, he had a conflict with Astyages, the King of Media (Medes), settled in the northern Zagros mountains. Herodotus describes that Astyages was the grandfather-in-law of Cyrus II with a typical hero legend of auspicious birth, trials, and following breakthroughs with agents (*Hdt.* 1.123) like the founding-father story of Sargon of Agade, Moses of Israel, Romulus and Remus of Rome, and Jumong of Goguryeo.⁹ Although the myth around Cyrus' early life is quite unreliable, it presupposes that Media claimed suzerainty over Persia in the earlier time.¹⁰ Similarly, Media had a close relationship with Babylon at that time since they collaborated with each other to conquer Assyria in 612~609 (Media: Cyaxares the father of Astyages; Babylonia; Nabopolassar the father of Nebuchadnezzar II).¹¹ However, as Briant rightly points out, in regard to critical matters, these legends would be evaluated with suspicion.¹²

⁸ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 17.

⁹ Sweeney, *TANAK*, 87. Astyages's ominous dream about Cyrus is similar to Laius's dream about Oedipus. Edwin M. Yamauchi, *Persia and the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1990), 80. If you want to know more about this pattern of the hero's journey, read Joseph J. Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1949).

¹⁰ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 15.

¹¹ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 22. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 32.

¹² "But it must be agreed that any information in the Classical authors is suspect. Moreover, they do not agree among themselves on the tradition of the Persian-Median marriages. Ctesias (§2) even asserts straightforwardly, 'Cyrus did not have the slightest degree of kinship with Astyages.' According to him, Amytis was married in 550 to the Mede Spitamas, and she was later wed to Cyrus after the execution of her husband. Berossus (FGrH 680 F7d) states that, after the fall of the Assyrian Empire, Astyages married his daughter Amytis to Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabopolassar—all assertions that are virtually incomprehensible in view of both chronology and history. The evidentiary confusion is such that doubts exist as to the reality of the Median marriage of Cambyses, father of Cyrus, inasmuch as it could offer a convenient ideological justification for the power of Cyrus in Media and even in Lydia. This is a motif found elsewhere in Herodotus, used to explain the first contacts between Cyrus and Amasis of Egypt and then the conquests led by Cambyses (III. 1-3). It seems clear that in most cases it is actually a dynastic justification invented post eventum." Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 24.

Cyrus's revolt against Media in 554 and the conquest of Ectabana in 550/549 was a major game changer. After that, Cyrus was the self-proclaimed heir of Astyages over Medo-Persian Kingdom.¹³ Within ten years, he had expanded his territory to the west. Even though there are chronological difficulties except in the case of the fall of Babylon (539) and the death of Cyrus (530), it is clear that Lydia was the first main target of Cyrus' western expedition. After hearing of the fall of Ectabana, Croesus the King of Lydia decided to attack Cyrus in 547. However, he was counterattacked and finally taken over by the Persian army. This fall of Sardis on the fourteenth day of the siege made a great impact, both on the ancient Near East and the Greek world.¹⁴

4.1.2. Conquest of Babylon in 539

The second major conquest occurred in Babylon. Cyrus's expedition to Babylon took place on October 12, 539. At that time, Babylon had an internal conflict because of Nabonidus' reform. This non-Chaldean king tried to shift the state religion from Marduk at Babylon to Sin at Haran. Also, while he was working on the Teima in Arabia, Belshazzar ruled over Babylon during his father's absence. This made the Babylonians angry. That is why when Cyrus II arrived in the city, citizens opened the gate without any resistance. Babylon really welcomed Cyrus because they were sick of Nabonidus.¹⁵ Babylonians shared a traumatic collective memory on how the Marduk statue and its sanctuary were plundered by Sennacherib as a harsh response against the revolt in 689 BCE. Although Esarhaddon rebuilt Babylon to try to end the cycle of

¹³ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 34.

¹⁴ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 34-36.

¹⁵ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 40-44.

revenge in 680, the memory of Sennacherib's blasphemy continued when Nabopolassar successfully took over Nineveh in 612: "The Babylonians did not forgive and forget the destruction of their city."¹⁶ In this vein, when Cyrus entered into Babylon in 539, he proclaimed himself as the righteous one chosen by Marduk to protect Babylon peacefully from the hands of the unlawful, unholy and blasphemous leader, Nabonidus. That is the propaganda contained in the Cyrus' Cylinder and the Verse Account of Nabonidus.¹⁷

This propaganda is not limited to Persian-Babylonian relations in the late sixth century B.C.E. Biblical accounts (2Chr 36:22-23; Ezra 1:2-4; 6:3-5) show how Cyrus treats his new subjects in a manner of tolerance and magnanimity like Cyrus' Cylinder does. Even though the audiences of the first (Babylonian) and the later (Jews) are different, the main theme is similar; 'Cyrus is a representative of the subject's deity(-ies). They will be allowed to return to the subject's homeland and to restore the subject's religious space and practices.' In this vein, Chronicler and Ezra comment that it is the fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophecy of seventy years of exile (Jer 25:11; 29:10). This atmosphere was reflected in Isa 40-55. Deutero-Isaiah described Cyrus as one who delivered exiled Jews from the hand of Babylon by using royal idioms (anointed, shepherd, and servant). The messianic description of Cyrus has long been debated in scholarship depending on how scholars situate Deutero-Isaiah: 1) pre-exilic futuristic expectation of Cyrus in the context of Sennacherib (Smith); 2) the name Cyrus is interpolated later into the

¹⁶ Marc Van de Mieroop, "Revenge, Assyrian Style" *Past & Present*, 179 (2003), 19.

¹⁷ "Nabonidus is accused of lawlessness; crimes against the temples and the people; the sculpturing of a monstrous statue of a foreign god, 'when nobody had ever seen before.' and building this god a temple at Harran; the squandering of other people's property; the oppression of the people of the land; a long sojourn abroad; the building of a palace at Tema which was comparable to the palace at Babylon; and, finally, he was accused of blasphemy, ignorance and stupidity." Dandamaev, *Political History* (1989), 50.

exilic version of Deutero-Isaiah (Torrey and Smart); 3) actual approval of this king Cyrus as the Davidic heir (Fried, Blenkinsopp); and 4) a chosen messiah by YHWH who is responsible for building the Temple, not an heir of Davidide (Sweeney). The biblical description of Cyrus is related to a comparison of the suffering servant(s) in the second part of Isaiah. Anti Laato presupposes that these contradictory themes would imply two major split groups within the community.¹⁸

4.1.3. Sheshbazzar and the Role of Babylon Exiles

Cyrus united Babylon and Eber-Nari (Trans-Euphrates) under one satrapal administration. Briant argues that this is “the only verifiable act” because of the lack of knowledge about what was happening in Eber-Nari during Cyrus’s time. In this respect, he presupposes that “it is possible that the province of Judah was not created until the time of Cambyses, since it seems clear that its governor received his instructions from the satrap of Babylonia via his subordinate in Trans-Euphrates.”¹⁹ However, biblical accounts report that some Jews were going back to their homeland right after the decree (538/7?). The first group of returning exiles came back to Yehud under the leadership of Sheshbazzar, the *nasi*’ (leader, chief, prince) of Judah (Ezra 1:8), whose Babylonian theophoric name means “may Shamash protect the father.” Some interpreters prefer to read the Hebrew term *nasi*’ as prince from the

¹⁸ Antti Laato, *The Servant of YHWH and Cyrus: A Reinterpretation of the Exilic Messianic Programme in Isaiah 40-55* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1992), 179. Concerning discussions on suffering servants, see Christopher R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study* (London: Oxford University Press, 1948); C. G. Kruse, “The Servant Songs: Interpretive Trends Since C. R. North,” *SBibT* 8 (1978): 3-27; Harry M. Orlinsky and Norman H. Snaith, *Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah* (Leiden: Brill, 1967).

¹⁹ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 49.

perspective identifying Shenazzar, the fourth son of Jehoiachin in 1Chr. 3:18. However, as Rainer Albertz points out, another Babylonian theophoric name implies a different deity, namely, Sin the moon god, not Shamash the sun god.²⁰ Also, the other problem is we have no idea who Sheshbazzar's father was, unlike the case of Zerubbabel who was the son of Shealtiel (Ezra 3:2, 8; 5:2; Neh 12:1; Hag 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 23). Albertz goes further to question the Sheshbazzar's identity as Jews, but I do not agree with him because Sheshbazzar was responsible to bring back the temple utensils (Ezra 1:8, 11; 5:14) and to lay the foundation of the Second Temple (Ezra 5:16) as *pehah* (governor) who follows the order of Cyrus. However, Sheshbazzar did not accomplish much of what he was actually supposed to do, so the actual event of laying the foundation of the Second Temple occurred under the leadership of Zerubbabel during the early reign of Darius (Ezra 3:6; 11; Hag 2:18; Zech 4:9; 8:9).

Since some groups of people of Judah and Jerusalem were taken into Babylon as captives three times (598/7, 587/6, 582), the exiled people were living near Babylon. Ezek 3:15 tells us the prophet and his *golah* community were living in the town name Tel-Abib which was located by the River Chebar, near Nippur. Archeological evidence also tells us that Jews were living in Babylon. Some Akkadian tablets mention the presence of a Judean town, which is called *al-Yahudu* (meaning, Judahville), in the region of Southern Mesopotamia (Babylon, Borsippa and Nippur). Most exiled Jews had a good relationship with Babylonian overlords. We know that Amel-Marduk released Jehoiachin from prison and invited him to the King's table (2Kgs 25:27-30; Jer 52:31-34). The Murasu archives show how Jews integrated and assimilated within

²⁰ Rainer Albertz, *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* trans. David Green (Atlanta: SBL, 2001; Originally published in German, 2001), 123.

Babylonian society in terms of economy and administration.²¹ Even though it is hard to find archeological evidence of the religious practices because of this tendency of assimilation, the biblical texts describe the *golah* community as having kept their faith at *Mikdash Me'at* (Ezek 11:16). As Peter R. Bedford and John Kessler discuss this matter, the Babylonian *golah* community had a great impact upon the life of the returnees (repatriates) in Yehud in terms of politics, economy and religion.²²

4.1.4. Diasporic Problems and the Myth of Empty Land

The deportation in 598/7 caused a great schism between those who remained in Judah (Zedekiah community) and those who were deported into Babylon (Jehoiachin community). Dalit Rom-Shiloni differentiated the earlier layers of the Book of Jeremiah which contain the prophet's voices to Jerusalemites and Judahites from the later one which is redacted by the exilic group in Babylon (so-called prophecies of consolation). Then, Rom-Shiloni argues that the audience of Jeremiah the prophet was "Those Who Remained" in Jerusalem (it is Rom-Shiloni's expression to contrast with the phrase, "the Babylonian Exiles").²³ His message is directed to the Remnant of Judah in Jer. 42:9-17. Therefore, following the Deuteronomic logic (calamity within the land; dispersion; exile existence in exile; restoration in/from exile), Jeremiah was worrying

²¹ Jeremiah W. Cataldo, *A Theocratic Yehud?: Issues of Government in a Persian Province*, LHBOTS 498 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 73.

²² Peter Ross Bedford, *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 41-83; "Diaspora: Homeland Relations in Ezra-Nehemiah" *VT* 52.2. (2002) 147-165; John Kessler, "Persia's Loyal Yahwists: Power Identity and Ethnicity in Achaemenid Yehud," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 91-121.

²³ I.e., Jeremiah's criticism of Jehoiachin in Jer 22:24-30; his calls to accept the subjugation to Babylon in Jer 27 (Rom-Shiloni does not see any pro-Babylonian clues because Jeremiah's concern the land in v.11-13).

about the loss of the land and criticizing those who had been exiled into Babylon. Even though some elements in the prophecies of consolation had pro-Judean insights, the later editor brought its own pro-golah conception. Jer. 24 is a clear example of the interest of the Jehoiachin Exiles.²⁴

In contrast with Jeremiah in the earlier layers, the Book of Ezekiel shows the interests of the Jehoiachin golah community. Ezekiel was one of those who were exiled in 598/7. He started his priestly-prophetic ministry from 593/2 (his age, thirty) to 573/2 (his age, fifty) in Tel-Abib, Babylon. During these twenty years, he built a new theological framework for the Jehoiachin Exiles, not for Those Who Remained under the rule of Zedekiah in Jerusalem (Ezek 11-12, 17, 33, 37). Unlike Jeremiah, he imagined that “the future belongs to an exilic leader, a descendent of Jehoiachin” (p.143). For example, Ezek 11:14-21 and 33:23-29 reveal Ezekiel’s disputation against those who remained in Judah and Jerusalem. Ezekiel was criticizing what they were doing in the Temple and re-designating the Exiles as a new “remnant of Israel.” (p.145) Because of the violation of the covenant, the Land should be judged, desolated, devastated, and emptied (Ezek 14). This empty land will be purified by those who will return from the exilic situation. (see Table 1 in pp.167-8).²⁵

As Jill Middlemas suggests, we can call this period the “Templeless age” after the destruction of the Temple in 587/6, which lasts until the dedication of the Second Temple in 515.²⁶ It includes not only Jeremiah and Ezekiel, but also the second part of the Book of Isaiah and other post-exilic literature. In the case of the second part of Isaiah, while some chapters

²⁴ Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity*, 198-252.

²⁵ Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity*, 139-197.

²⁶ Jill Middlemas, *The Templeless Age: An Introduction to the History, Literature, and Theology of the “Exile”* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007).

reflect the circumstances of Babylon (chs. 40-48), others reflect the situation of Jerusalem (chs. 49-55, 56-66). The problem is, endless discussions identify this anonymous narrator of Second and Third Isaiah. For identifying who this narrator is, Hans M. Barstad and Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer both prefer to see him as one who belonged to Those Who Remained “on Palestinian soil” because they not only include illiterate peasants but also “artisans, traders village and town elders, scribes, priests, and prophets.”²⁷ Unlike them, Dalit Rom-Shiloni continues to hold the traditional view that sees this narrator as one who had returned from the Babylonian Exile to an empty land. She points out that the narrator of Isa 40-66 (following Haran and Paul’s thematic continuity between chs. 40-48 and chs. 49-66) supports the ideology of the Repatriates to describe the land as “empty” and “devastated” even though there were many residents living in the land. For them, these residents were considered to be ‘the other.’²⁸ However, Rom-Shiloni’s logic is limited because she is focusing on the synchronic structure rather than the diachronic factors.

4.1.5. Cyrus’s Imperialism

Because Briant calls Cyrus, along with Cambyses, the land-collector, his role in the expedition is very similar with what previous kings did in ancient Near Eastern empires “without mission” (of civilization).²⁹ Berquist well points out that: “Cyrus’ chief imperial expansion therefore was not administrative. The growth of law and of bureaucratic systems for imperial

²⁷ Hans M. Barstad, *The Babylonian Captivity of the Book of Isaiah: “Exilic” Judah and the Provenance of Isaiah 40-55* (Oslo: Novus forlag, 1997), 84-87, 92-93; Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage*, 286, 289.

²⁸ Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity*, 101-104.

²⁹ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 31; Bagg, “Palestine under Assyrian Rule,” 119-144.

enforcement represented little or no change from the previous Babylonian imperial involvement with the periphery.”³⁰ Nevertheless, Cyrus’ policy is different from that of the previous empire even though Persia still maintains the infrastructure of the Babylonian administration.³¹ While Babylon made efforts to intensify the movement of all human labor and material to Babylon from peripheral regions, Persia did not. To manage its expanded territory efficiently, they decided to send back their subjects to peripheral areas (what Berquist calls a colony) and put them under the jurisdiction of Persian officials.

4.2. Cambyses II (r. 530-522)

4.2.1. Cambyses in Egypt

Cambyes is the other land-collector that Briant names. After Cyrus died during his expedition against the Massagetae of Central Asia in 530, Cambyses II succeeded to his throne. Then he continued on his father’s military expedition to the west. Now Persia turned its eyes to Egypt, which was ruled by the Sais dynasty.³² During the next several decades, Egypt was under

³⁰ Berquist, *Judaism in Persia’s Shadow*, 24.

³¹ Berquist, *Judaism in Persia’s Shadow*, 25.

³² In fact, this native dynasty was established in the aftermath of the Assyrian’s fourteen years of campaigns and conquest over Egypt under the Kushite dynasty. After the sack of Thebes in Upper Egypt in 663 B.C.E. (Nah. 3:8-10) as a response to the death of Necho I of Sais one year before, Psamtik I declared himself as the Pharaoh who ruled over all of Egypt then tried to be freed from Assyrian yoke of vassalship. While Abraham Malamat, Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor infers Psamtik I as an active anti-Assyrian who tries to make an international alliance with Gyges of Lydia, who sent military aids to Egypt. Abraham Malamat, “Josiah’s Bid for Armageddon: The Background of the Judean-Egyptian Encounter in 609 B.C.” *JANESCU* 5 (1973) 272. Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor “Gyges and Ashurbanipal: A Study in Literary Transmission” *Or* 46 (1977) 79. If so, with the consideration of Shamash-shum-ukin’s revolt in 652, anti-Assyrian alliance would be reconstructed on the global level from Egypt, Asia Minor, and Babylon. Chronicler’s account Menasseh’s deportation into Babylon would be reviewed in this regard. Marvin A. Sweeney, *Reading the Hebrew Bible After the Shoah: Engaging Holocaust Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008), 75-76. However, Anthony J. Spalinger suggests that the Egypt-

the severe pressure of internal conflict as a result of the *coup d'etat* of General Amasis (later, Amasis II) against Pharaoh Apries in 570. After a short time as a refugee, Apries came back to Egypt with Nebuchadnezzar II's military aid in 567 but the effort failed.³³ Apries was killed and the Babylonian Empire was never established in Egypt. As Briant points out, we do not have any ideas on what happened between Pharaoh Amasis II and King Cyrus II, but we can infer some tensions between Egypt and Persia based on Herodotus's two versions, one from the Persians and the other from the Egyptians (*Hdt.* 3.1-3). Here is Briant's summary and comment.

Cyrus supposedly asked Amasis to send him the finest Egyptian oculist. At the urging of this specialist, Cambyses (Persian version) or Cyrus (Egyptian version) supposedly demanded that Amasis send one of his daughters to the Persian court. In the Persian version, she was to marry Cambyses; the Egyptians claimed that she was married to Cyrus and that Cambyses was born of this union. In yet another version, the young Cambyses supposedly swore to avenge his mother Cassandane, who had been humiliated by seeing Cyrus replace her with the Egyptian girl. The only point of agreement among all the versions collected by Herodotus is that Amasis deliberately tricked the Persian king: instead of his own daughter, he supposedly sent Nitetis, the daughter of the previous pharaoh, Apries. That Amasis hoodwinked him in this fashion infuriated Cambyses. To all appearances, this tradition seems to reflect later Persian propaganda, and the historian would do well not to take it into consideration.³⁴

Whether or not the historicity of Herodotus is correct, this story implies that the internal

Lydia relations were not based on anti-Assyrian. Anthony Spalinger, "Psammetichus: King of Egypt I" *JARCE* 13 (1976) 143 (endnote 6); "The Date of the Death of Gyges and Its Historical Implications" *JAOS* 98.4 (1978) 402. Although Psamtik I continued an ambivalent frenemy relationship with Assyria, the Assyrian-Egyptian relations are generally tied together with military alliance even after Nineveh was taken over by the Babylonian-Median alliance in 612. Necho II sent his military forces to the Syro-Palestine area depending on his influence from the new power from the east. Following battles at Megiddo (609) and Carchemish (605) happened in this vein. However, Egypt failed to block Babylonian crossing of the Euphrates and had to withdraw from Syro-Palestine (Jer 46:2). Following events in Ashkelon (604), Jerusalem (598/7, 587/6) and Tyre (586-573) would be regarded in this context.

³³ Ivan A. Ladynin, "Iw («Island») and uruPUTU-yAMAN («The City of Greek Buto»): Two Toponymes in the Sources on the Babylonian Invasion into Egypt in 567 B.C.," in *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Egyptologists*, ed. Jean-Claude Goyon and C. Cardin (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 1071-76.

³⁴ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 49.

conflicts between the pro-Apries group and the pro-Amasis group continued even into the 520s, regardless of the fact that Amasis II ruled over Egypt for forty-four years. Persia may well acknowledge and utilize this conflict to justify their conquest and colonization of Egypt. After Psamtik III the son of Amasis was defeated at the Battle of Pelusium in 525, the Persian army rapidly entered and conquered Memphis, Lower Egypt. Since Ashurbanipal sacked Thebes in 664, Egypt was again into the Mesopotamian sphere of influence. Cambyses proclaimed himself the new Pharaoh of all Egypt (as the founder of the twenty-seventh dynasty of Egypt) and Egypt was ruled by Persian Aryandes under the satraphal administration system.³⁵

4.2.2. Udjahorresnet

The autobiographical inscription on Udjahorresnet's statue (probably located in the temple of Osiris at Sais) was very important to understand how the colonization proceeded in Cambyses' Egypt.³⁶ Udjahorresnet served as a naval commander under Amasis II and Psamtik III.³⁷ Even though the inscriptions tell us he has other titles, including medical physician and priest, Briant said that it is necessary to clarify whether these are honorary titles or actual functions.³⁸ While Briant remains skeptical, Dandamaev evaluates very differently the report that he "did not put up any resistance to the advancing Persians. He surrendered Sais and the fleet without a fight."³⁹ Since Persia ruled over Egypt, Udjahorresnet shifted his loyalty to the new

³⁵ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 61, 64.

³⁶ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 88, 91; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 54, 56-60, 473; Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 74-75, 77-78, 81-82.

³⁷ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 88; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 54.

³⁸ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 81.

³⁹ Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 75.

Persian dynasty. He collaborated with Persian colonizers and protected the interests of Egyptian overlords. Even though after the war Egypt rapidly went back to normal without any significant economic damages, there was some plunder against the temple of Neith at Sais by some of the Persian army. Even though Cambyses did not need to take charge of this event, he ordered the troops to stop and recompensed the damage inflicted on the temple at Sais.⁴⁰ Cambyses followed his father's policy and allowed the Egyptians a certain level of cultural and religious freedom.⁴¹ In this vein, it is necessary to regard Udjahorresnet's mission to restore and revive Egyptian customs, medical knowledge and religious practices performed within the Persian umbrella. This will be further discussed below.

Like the fall of Sardis, the conquest of Egypt was shown as a serious threat to the Greek world. Cambyses had long been described by ancient Greek historians (*Hdt.* 3.89) as a mad tyrant in contrast to his father Cyrus II.⁴² The description of Cambyses shifted from one who had pity on his opponents (*Hdt.* 3.14) to one who suffered from a serious mental illness (*Hdt.* 3.25, 29, 30). The climax of this alleged madness was that Cambyses killed the sacred Apis bull and its priests (*Hdt.* 3.29). However, as Olmstead points out, this story, including all the following mad doings (*Hdt.* 3.30-38), "must be discounted" because "while Cambyses was absent on his Ethiopian expedition, the sacred bull died" naturally in his sixth year, 524.⁴³ According to Egyptian texts. Cambyses even offered a beautiful sarcophagus for its burial. The next Apis was born and raised under the reign of Darius I. So, all of these accounts of Cambyses' madness are

⁴⁰ Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 77; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 58.

⁴¹ Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 79.

⁴² Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 50.

⁴³ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 89-90; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 56; Jenny Rose, *Zoroastrianism: An Introduction* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2011), 62.

based on Greek-Egyptian propaganda against Persia. As Dandamaev rightly points out, “the story of Herodotus, however, can hardly be linked to the account given by Udjahorresne, including the information that Cambyses sojourned at Sais for another reason, namely for the worship of the goddess Neith.”⁴⁴

4.2.3. Internal Crisis in 522

Cambyses’s long stay in Egypt creates internal disability in the capital Ectabana. The end of Cambyses is very opaque and even chaotic. One thing that is clear is that Cambyses died (committed suicide?) in Syria without producing any children after he returned from Egypt in 522. Alongside this, we have Persian and Greek sources that agree that Cambyses murdered his brother Bardiya (Behistun) or Smerdis (*Hdt.* 3.30). Modern historians are suspicious of both sources because of their propagandistic nature. Olmstead argues that the story about Gaumata in Behistun might be Darius’ fabrication to hide his coup d’etat and his collateral family connection with Achaemenids.⁴⁵ Therefore, it is difficult to investigate and evaluate the death of Bardiya/Smerdis/Tanyoxarces/Tanoxares/Mergis/Mardos. Even if, before he himself died, Cambyses murdered his brother because of his brother charged him with usurpation, it means that the murder creates a more serious power vacuum in the core of Persian Empire because the seat of power was empty after Cambyses and his brother both passed away. For these reasons, this event leaves a space in which a pretender can claim the right to hereditary succession like “Bardiya/Smerdis the royal brother” and claim the throne in this power vacuum. The subsequent

⁴⁴ Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 82.

⁴⁵ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 109.

appearance of the Gaumata should be understood in this vein. While Behistun inscription said this man was the *magus* whose name was Gaumata, Greek historians use various terms to call him a pseudo-Smerdis/Sphencladates/Oropastes.⁴⁶ Even though ancient historians had stigmatized him as the pretender, still it is possible to suggest “the person whom Darius called ‘magus Gaumata,’ were one and the same person, namely the younger son of Cyrus.”⁴⁷ This failed usurper ruled only briefly, but he tried to exempt his subjects from taxation.⁴⁸ In this vein, Berquist suggests that Gaumata/Bardiya might be on the side of peasants and the poor.⁴⁹ However, Briant views this quite differently. He regards Gaumata/Bardiya as someone who might be aligned with the tribal nobility who have trouble with Cambyse’s policy.⁵⁰ Even though we still do not exactly know who Gaumata/Bardiya is, it is quite clear that all diverse historiography around 522 is deeply involved in an attempt to justify Darius I, the other successful usurper, as Olmstead refers to him.⁵¹

4.3. Darius I (r. 522-486)

4.3.1. Darius and the Dynastic Problems

According to the author from Halicarnassus, Darius, who was born in c. 550, was a lance-bearer (*doryphoros*) of Cambyse in Egypt. Although the title does not come with “much [in the line of] duties as [do other] court titles.” Herodotus describes him as “at that time one of

⁴⁶ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 98-99.

⁴⁷ Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 91.

⁴⁸ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 93.

⁴⁹ Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow*, 46.

⁵⁰ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 104-6.

⁵¹ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 107.

Cambyzes' guards and as yet a man of no great importance" (*Hdt.* 3.139). Even though Herodotus reports that his father Hystaspes is the "governor of Persia," the Behistun Inscription says that he held a position of "high military command in Parthia" in 522.⁵² Unlike the Cyrus' Cylinder which takes Cyrus II's genealogy back to Cyrus II-Cambyzes I-Cyrus I-Teispes, the Behistun Inscription skips Cyrus II, his father, and his grandfather according to Darius I's genealogy. Therefore, Darius's genealogy includes Darius I-Hystaspes-Arsames-Ariaramnes-Teispes-Achaemenes. This creates the problem of legitimation of Darius as the King of Persia.⁵³ Herodotus reports that Darius decides to marry with two daughters of Cyrus (both Atossa, the ex-wife of Cambyzes and Smerdis/Bardiya) and one daughter of Smerdis/Bardiya (*Hdt.* 3.88). This string of strategic diplomatic marriages continues with Darius's relationship with his six fellow nobles. However, as Briant critically points out:

But the discussions recorded by Herodotus about the royal succession show that there was never any real question of transmitting power to his eldest son, born of this exogamous marriage (VII.2). As we shall soon see, the policy of the Great King consisted of parceling out his daughters, a matrimonial policy that holds exactly the opposite of the meaning attributed to it by Herodotus. And the successors of Darius singlemindedly followed the same policy. It was not until the reign of Darius II that the royal family became open to exogamous marriages.⁵⁴

In this vein, Briant discusses more deeply why Darius' genealogical retrospective includes not only Teispes but also Achaemenes with the omission of Cyrus. Even though he intends to show himself belonging to collateral lines from Cyrus's family by mentioning Teispes, the two different genealogies seem not to harmonize with each other. As Briant said, the one way

⁵² Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 112.

⁵³ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 108; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 110; Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 108.

⁵⁴ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 132.

to harmonize this difference is “to suppose that Teispes divided his kingdom into two branches” but this theory cannot be supported because we have no evidence of such a second dynasty in Persia.⁵⁵ As Dandamaev correctly points out, Greek writers did not say anything of the royal origin of Darius.⁵⁶ Instead, Briant sees that Darius borrows an eponymous ancestor, Achaemenes, for legitimizing his royal right with a new founder legend that “Achaemenes was said to have been fed and raised by an eagle.” Unlike Cyrus who uses the term “Achaemenid” in the nuance of family clan, Darius adds more political values as the royal dynasty.⁵⁷

As for the word *Achaemenid* itself, it is clear that Darius uses it in a very narrow sense. For him it does not refer to a clan—which is how we understand Herodotus's *phratrides*. It is a name that applies exclusively to the members of Darius's patrilineal family. It is also in this sense that the new king used the word in the fraudulent Pasargadae inscriptions supposedly created by Cyrus (*CMa-b-c* = *DMa-b-c*). By describing Cyrus quite simply as "king" and Achaemenid, Darius was trying to mask his familial manipulations by making Cyrus the fictive ancestor of the new royal family. Here the term clearly referred to the royal family, for we cannot see what Darius would have gained by stressing that Cyrus belonged to the clan/phratry of the Achaemenids.⁵⁸

Therefore, it is necessary to discuss Herodotus' description of the Seven Nobles when Smerdis/Bardiya was removed from the throne in 522. Before going into this, it is necessary to know that the Behistun Inscription also lists the six names of those who need rural protection for him and his family. Briant argues that these names are, except in the latter case, equivalent to Herodotus' lists: Intaphernes, Otanes, Gobryas, Hydarnes, Megabyzus, and Aspathine (*Hdt.* 3.80-88).⁵⁹ Even though Beistun keeps silent on what happened with them but just emphasizes

⁵⁵ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 110.

⁵⁶ Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 108.

⁵⁷ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 18-19, 92, 111.

⁵⁸ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 111.

⁵⁹ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 108.

divine protection by Ahura-Mazda, the mention of these six names gives a hint of a connection with Herodotus even though Briant does not trust his account at face value.⁶⁰ So, he sees that the discussion around political systems between Otanes (democracy), Megabyzus (oligarchy), and Darius (monarchy) is totally fictional from a Greek perspective. Instead, Briant sees that the main problem in 522 is not about a monarchic principle but a dynastic problem, which means “the absence of direct heir.”⁶¹ However, as Dandamaev comments, Herodotus’s discussion implies that there are internal tensions between tribal nobility and royal power in the context of gradual centralization: “During the reign of Cyrus II the nobility held a series of privileges. During the reign of Cambyses, however, a historically irreversible development commenced towards a more centralized royal authority and towards more independence of the state from tribal nobility. During the reign of Gaumata the strife between tribal nobility and royal power continued. A clear reflection of this struggle is found in the speech of Otanes, who argues against monarchy.”⁶² As Briant rightly points out, Darius was not a “self-made man,” but became a king with the aid of his fellow nobles (council of Seven) even if this man had more rights than

⁶⁰ Olmstead considered Zoroaster as one who was acting as a prophet in the middle of the sixth century. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 94. By doing this, he showed that the monotheistic tendency of Iranian religion had affected Yahwistic religion in the post-exilic community. Dandamaev and Lukonin also prefer to date this figure “no later than the seventh century B.C.” Dandamaev and Lukonin, *The Culture and Social Institution*, 323. However, as Jenny Rose points out, “Most historical texts on the Achaemenids do not dwell on trying to define their religion... The religion of the Ancient Persians was a far remove from the state Zoroastrianism of late Sasanian times.” Rose, *Zoroastrianism*, 32. In this respect, Briant carefully uses this term to describe the faith of Achaemenids. Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 93-94.

⁶¹ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 109. Briant continues to note that: “Keeping in mind the Greek garb in which Herodotus’s report appears, we understand that Gobryas and three other conspirators (Intaphernes, Hydarnes, Ardumanis) supported Darius’s royal claims from the beginning, and the other two (Otanis and Megabyzus) did not interfere. In fact, Otanes then chose to remove himself from the royal competition.” Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 113.

⁶² Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 106.

others.⁶³

4.3.2. Six Liar Kings

During the first two years of Darius' reign (522-521), Darius faced several rebels in 1) Persia and Media; 2) Iranian Plateau and Central Asia; and 3) Elam and Babylon. Behistun lists the Nine Liars including Gaumata/Bardiya. Except in the case of the last one, this would be considered the correct chronological order: Gaumata (Persia), Acina (Elam), Nidintu-Bel (Babylon), Fravartis (Media), Martiya (Elam), Cicantakhma (Sagartia), Vahyazdata (Persia), Arkha (Babylon), and Frada (Margiana).⁶⁴ Interestingly, those rebels claimed to possess legitimate and hereditary heritage in line with the previous local dynasty. For instance, in Babylon, Nidintu-Bel (Nebuchadnezzar III) claimed himself to be "Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabonidus." Armenian Arkha (Nebuchadnezzar IV) also did the same thing in Babylon even though he was a foreigner. Briant comments that "this choice reflected a clear political intent to resume the course of local history and close what was by implication only a parenthesis of Achaemenid dominion."⁶⁵

Interestingly, Behistun keeps silent on the insurrections in Lydia and Egypt that Herodotus and other Greek historians deliberate. In the case of Lydia, it was performed not by native Lydians, but by Oroetes, the Persian satrap (*Hdt.* 3.127). The insubordination of the local governor usually happened within the imperial context that covers a large territory. We will see a similar case from the grandson of Megabyzus, one of the members of the Seven and also the

⁶³ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 112.

⁶⁴ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 115-6.

⁶⁵ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 120.

satrap of Babylonian and later of Eber-Nari.⁶⁶ Even though the Behistun alludes to the rebellions by Egyptians, Sakas, and Sattagydiens, it does not go further into detail; even Herodotus did not mention it. For us, reconstructing what happened in Egypt, 521-518 is very important to accurately review the circumstances in Yehud. However, there are multiple presuppositions that impact the reconstruction of this event, but, as yet, no historical evidence. One possible theory would be that thinking of the role of Aryandes, the satrap of Egypt who was appointed by Cambyses. Aryandes may play a critical role in the suppression of the revolt of a local dynasty, Petubastis in 521.⁶⁷ Herodotus reports that this satrap issues inferior silver coinage in the early reign of Darius (*Hdt.* 4.166). This satrap may not necessarily show his loyalty to his new king as Dandamaev infers.⁶⁸ Because of this, Darius may resort to some actions to settle internal conflicts within the Egyptian community, such as paying homage to a sacred bull of Apis who died on August 31, 518.⁶⁹ Briant continues,

This could explain why Polyaeus says (VII. 11.7), "unable to bear the severity (*omotes*) of Aryandes, the Egyptians revolted." He proceeds to tell how Darius resumed personal control of the country—a story entirely dedicated to exalting the homage paid to the Apis by the king/pharaoh. The date of these events is not certain, but if we separate—as seems reasonable—these events from the revolt mentioned by Darius at Behistun, we may suggest that they date back to the last decade of the sixth century. Perhaps the Egyptians,

⁶⁶ For instance, during the first half of the eighth-century, Shamshi-ilu the *turtanu* (commander-in-chief) had a high level of prominence and power in Bit-Adini province in Assyrian Empire. Even though we had eponymic and inscriptional evidence of royal expeditions to the west by Adad-nirari III, Shalmanezar IV, Ashur-dan III and Ashurninari V, his solid control over the west was crucial to understand the diminishing of Aram-Damascus and the last revival of Northern Israel. Jeffrey Kah-Jin Kuan, *Neo-Assyrian Historical Inscriptions and Syria-Palestine: Israelite/Judean-Tyrian-Damascene Political and Commercial in the Ninth-Eighth Centuries BCE* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016; Originally published in Hong Kong, 1995), 69-134.

⁶⁷ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 115.

⁶⁸ Dandamaev disagrees with Olmstead's reconstruction in 518 that Darius showed his condolences with the death of the new Apis bull, reinstated Aryandes, and then hurriedly leaving Egypt. Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 141-3; Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 142.

⁶⁹ The successor of a sacred bull who died in 524. Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 479-482.

exhausted by the burden of assessments imposed by Aryandes, brought their complaint to the Great King, who then came to restore order. According to this hypothesis, Aryandes would have contravened the very strict measures taken by the Great King when, around 518, he implemented a revaluation of tribute in weighed silver, an action that was considered fair by several ancient authors. Let us stress meanwhile that, according to Herodotus himself, it was not this kind of deed that provoked Darius's response. In his view, the king wished to punish the excesses of a satrap who had tried to become his rival in the very area Darius considered the defining characteristic of his reign and his power.⁷⁰

The satrapal position might be replaced by a new satrap Pherendates when Darius arrived in Memphis at the end of the summer of 518.⁷¹

4.3.3. Zerubbabel Problem

This historical grayness continues when we are dealing with Yehud in 521-518. Olmstead described, following Chronicler's view, that Zerubbabel was the grandson of Jehoiachin, and became a governor by Darius after the Sukkot in 520.⁷² The arrival of this Davidic figure was conjoined with nationalistic hope of post-exilic prophets like Haggai and Zechariah. However, because of this project of revolt, Zerubbabel "presumably" was summoned and executed as a rebel when Darius was doing the march against Egypt in 519-518.⁷³ Even though he notices that Behistun does not tell anything about the Jews, Dandamaev describes the ways biblical scholars link Post-exilic Yehud with insurrections by Nidintu-Bel and Arkha in Babylonia. This does not mean he agrees with Olmstead's reconstruction of Yehud-Babylonian solidarity. Following P. R. Ackroyd's opinion, he sees that prophetic calls for independent monarchy are "not oriented

⁷⁰ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 410.

⁷¹ Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 141-3; Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 142.

⁷² Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 136.

⁷³ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 142.

towards a concrete political situation, but are general remarks.”⁷⁴ Briant is also suspicious of that reconstruction and requests permission to read the prophetic text carefully. The reason why, he argues is that it is “unlikely that the Jews, just fifteen or so years after their difficult and harsh return, would have had the men and energy needed to contemplate seriously the restoration of the ancient monarchy for the benefit of Zerubbabel.”⁷⁵

In fact, in biblical scholarship, there is a tendency to infer a global level of insurrections against the dominant regime. The typical example of this global alliance is the anti-Assyrian alliance by twelve countries led by Adad-Idri (Hadadezer) of Aram-Damascus and Ahab of Northern Israel against Shalmaneser III in the Battle of Qarqar in 841 with respect to Assyrian texts (no reports on this in Hebrew historiographies).⁷⁶ The Syro-Ephraimite alliance between Rezin and Pekah in 736-732 also would be another form of resistance to Assyria and its vassal-state Judah. This type of alliance is limited within the regional level of Syro-Palestine and reviewed by Assyrian and Hebrew accounts even though both have a propagandistic nature.⁷⁷ When we consider the international backgrounds of Hezekiah’s revolt in 701 and Manasseh’s detention in the 650s, the scale of the presumed alliance is expanded to a global level even beyond the Euphrates. In these two cases, it is easy to depend upon Hebrew historiography whether it is Deuteronomistic or Chronicler’s. When we deal with a hypothetical revolt by

⁷⁴ Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 128; Peter R. Ackroyd, “Two Historical Problems of the Early Persian Period” *JNES* 17 (1958) 13-27.

⁷⁵ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 115-6, 351.

⁷⁶ Kuan, *Neo-Assyrian Historical Inscriptions*, 5-68.

⁷⁷ For more discussions, read Tae-Hun Kim, *Assyrian Historical Inscriptions and Political and Economic Relations Among Assyria, the Syro-Palestinian States, and Egypt in the Eighth-Seventh Centuries BCE*. (PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2002).

Zerubbabel in 520-518, we realize that only prophetic texts imply that such rebels fulfill the messianic expectation of a new Davidic monarch while historiography keeps silent.

Another problem is who Zerubbabel is. As we discussed above, the father of Zerubbabel is Shealtiel (Ezra 3:2, 8; 5:2; Neh 12:1; Hag 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 23). Traditionally, his Davidic lineage is supported by mentioning Shealtiel and Zerubbabel within the Davidic genealogy in 1Chr. 3. Chronicler reports Shealtiel was the first son of Jehoiachin (1Chr 3:17), who was deported into Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar II (2Kgs 24:12-16; 2Chr 36:10) and who joined the royal table with Amel-Marduk (2Kgs 25:27-30; Jer 52:31-34). Since no sons are listed under his name, we can say that Shealtiel might be sonless or childless. The name Zerubbabel is found under the name of Pedaiah, the third son of Jehoiachin (1Chr 3:19). For reconciling this problem, there are multiple hypothetical alternatives: 1) Pedaiah became a new head of family after the death of Shealtiel (Myers); 2) Pedaiah married the widow of Shealtiel and adopted his son Zerubbabel through the levirate marriage system (Keil, Rudolph); 3) two Zerubbabels who were cousins from Shealtiel and Pedaiah each (Albright); 4) Zerubebbel ben Shealtiel was raised by Pedaiah (Ibn Ezra).⁷⁸ With their favor in the second theory, Klein and Krüger (2006) presuppose that the identification of Shealtiel as the father of Zerubbabel resulted from “someone who understandably considered Shealtiel as the firstborn, the one through whom the Davidic line continued.” Sara Japhet (1982)’s treatment is standing by the third theory, but her decision seems a little bit vague.⁷⁹ If we bring genealogies from the New Testament Gospels, it gets more

⁷⁸ Ralph W. Klein and Thomas Krüger, *I Chronicles, Hermeneia* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006), 120.

⁷⁹ “The harmonistic way is to keep both testimonies and justify the fact that Zerubbabel is presented as son of both Shealtiel and Pedaiah. The critical approach offers two solutions. One is to assume that there is an error in the Massoretic text and that the Septuagint reading “the son of Shealtiel” in 1Chr 3.19 is correct. The other is to accept

complicated: Matthew refers to Zerubbabel as ben Shealtiel ben Jeconiah (Jehoiachin) (Matt 1:12-13). In case of Luke, Zerubbabel is ben Shealtiel ben Neri (Luke 3:27). Therefore, as Klein and Krüger comment, we should “admit that the Bible identifies two people as Zerubbabel's father and that there is no certain way to resolve this conflict.”⁸⁰

The theory of Zerubbabel as the Davidic heir is grounded in prophetic implications with no direct mention of David in Haggai and Zechariah (except Zech 12:7, 8 12, 10; 13:1). Haggai describes Zerubbabel as a divine signet ring (*hotam*) when he is hearing about an apocalyptic vision of how God will overturn thrones and its troops of kingdoms (*mamlakot*) and nations (*goyim*) (Hag 2:22-23). Haggai does not specify which kingdoms and nations will be overthrown by God or when. It is possible to say that the use of *hotam* implies the recognition of the royal heritage of Zerubbabel. When we review the usage of *hotam* in the Hebrew Bible, the engraving seal or signet ring represents the leader's authority like that of the patriarch (Gen 38:18), chief elder of tribe (Exo 28:11, 21; 39:6), priest (Exo 28:36; 39:30) or king (1Kgs 21:8; Jer 22:24). In the case of the term *taba'at*, it means not just ~~about~~ royal authority (Gen 41:42; Esth 3:10, 12; 8:2, 8, 10), but also highlights its ornamental values (Exo 25-28, 30, 35-39; Num 31:50; Isa 3:2). In other words, the engraving seal or signet ring is the general symbolic vehicle to represent

the evidence of both texts without compromise and simply to say that we are dealing here with two different men: Zerubbabel the son of Pedaiah, a descendant of the House of David listed in the genealogy of 1Chr 3.19 but not mentioned in the historical narrative—and Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel, one of the leaders of the Restoration period who was not included in the genealogy because he had no son to continue his name. In spite of these difficulties, there is no doubt—even for those who regard Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel and Zerubbabel son of Pedaiah as different personalities—that Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel is of Davidic lineage.“ Sara Japhet, “Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel: Against the Background of the Historical and Religious Tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah No.1” *ZAW* 94.1 (1982), 72. See also her second article on this topic, “Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel: Against the Background of the Historical and Religious Tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah No.2” *ZAW* 95.2 (1983), 218-229.

⁸⁰ Klein and Krüger, *1 Chronicles*, 120.

authority in the ancient Near Eastern culture. According to Jer 22:24, Jehoiachin is described as possessing a divine signet ring (*hotam*) yet God will tear it off soon. From this point of view, lots of commentators compare Jehoiachin and Zerubbabel within the framework of judgment and restoration. However, as Dalit Rom-Shiloni rightly observes, it is necessary to carefully deal with the contradictory messages about Jechoiachin and Zedekiah in the Book of Jeremiah.⁸¹ The concept of Jerusalem/Judah as “the empty land forever” is rooted in this anti-Jehoiachin line of thought (Jer. 25:11-12). On the contrary, Jer 24:22 refers to Jehoiachin and his community in Babylon as “good figs.” It even goes further with a promise to break the Babylonian yoke and restore the Jehoiachian community (Jer 28:4). This pro-Jehoiachin atmosphere continues when Jeremiah reaffirms the restoration after seventy years of captivity (Jer 29:10). Interestingly, even though post-exilic writers clearly know about the fulfillment of Jeremiah’s prophecy, they are aligned to the pro-Jehoiachin line of thought. So, it is hard to say that Haggai’s use of the term “signet ring” carries the same nuances as they do in Jer 22:24. If he should talk about the restoration of the Davidic monarchy with consideration to Jeremiah, he should borrow the metaphoric languages like *zumah* (shoot, branch, bud) in Jer 33:15-18 (c.f. Isa 4:2, in Isa 11:1, Isaiah uses *choter* (shoot, branch, rod) for describing a future Davidic figure). The futuristic expectation of *zumah* as a divine servant would be imagined in the context of reaffirmation of Joshua’s priesthood in the divine council in Zech 3:8 and 6:11-13. Wolter H. Rose (2000) argues that it is not about a royal figure as pre-exilic prophets expect, but it is about a priestly figure

⁸¹ Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity*, 198-252.

according to Zechariah's perspective in the post-exilic context.⁸² Bryon G. Curtis (2006) also supports this: "The future expectation expressed in Zech 3:8 is thoroughly inappropriate for referring to Zerubbabel, a figure who is already present in Yehud."⁸³

Zech 4:14 describes Zerubbabel, along with Joshua ben Jehozadak, as one of two sons of fresh olive oil (*Bnei-HaYitzhar*) for serving YHWH. This symbolic expression is used only once in this verse within the Hebrew Bible. It appears when *HaMal'ak* (messenger, angel) delivers a divine vision of the Temple inside, particularly of two olive trees standing right and left of the seven-branched *menorah* (candlestick, lampstand) in the Holy Place (Zech 1:1-3). The specific image and function of these two trees are revealed in Zechariah's second question (Zech 1:11-12). From those trees, its two branches are connected with a menorah to provide the golden olive oil endlessly through two golden pipes. So, the fundamental and primary mission of *Bnei-HaYitzhar* is related to the Temple itself. In other words, the purpose of two is primarily liturgical rather than political at least from Zechariah's point of view. The symbolic description of Zerubbabel in Zech 4:6-10 is very close to the role of Temple-builder: bring out capstone (*HaEbed HaRo'sha'*) from the mountains (v.6), laying the foundation (*yasad*) of the Second temple (v.8), and handing the plumbline (v.10). 1Kgs 5:17 (MT v.31) describes how Solomon

⁸² Wolter H. Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectation in the Early Postexilic Period*. JSOTSup 304 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 123-4, 130-141.

⁸³ Bryon G. Curtis, *Up the Steep and Stony Road: The Book of Zechariah in Social Location Trajectory Analysis*. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2006), 136. While he was holding Zerubbabel as *Zemah* in terms of a Davidic heir, Lisbeth S. Fried disagrees with Rose's theory because it is "far removed from the plain sense of the text" because Rose describes *Zemah* as one "who will then build a third, more-glorious temple." Lisbeth S. Fried, *The Priest and the Great King: Temple-Palace Relations in the Persian Empire* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 204-206 (footnote 182. 185). If it is anachronistic of identifying Zerubbabel with *Zemah*, it is also anachronistic if *Zemah*'s role is for the "future more glorious temple" within the context before the dedication of the Second Temple in 515. To add to that, Rose admits that "it is difficult to be absolutely certain" on *Zemah*'s role in building another new temple. Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel*, 137-9.

ordered quarrying large quality stones to place as the foundation of the First Temple as dressed ones.⁸⁴ The images of measuring the temple are found not only using plumbline here but also rod (Ezek 40:3, 5), and line (Ezek 40:3; Zech 1:16; 2:1; c.f. Job 38:5). The expression that the mountain becomes the level ground would be related to the divine highway motif (Exo 15; Hab 3; Isa 35, 40) although here it implies the quarrying work per se. In sum, the role of Zerubbabel is deeply connected to the Temple-builder in relation to the purification of Joshua for making him ready for the priestly role (Zech 3). Then, it is possible to ask how we deal with *HaMal'ak's* confident promise that this construction will be done (*tebatza 'nah*) by the “hands of” Zerubbabel in Zech 4:9. Depending on how we treat this term hands literally or metaphorically, our reading would diverge. Here I prefer to deal with this term as metaphoric and collective sense to represent the right and responsibility for his people under the governor’s supervision.

For these reasons, it is possible to say that Haggai and Zechariah reveal their prophetic expectation on Zerubbabel ben Shaltiel concerning his responsibility to organize and oversee people rebuilding the Temple with the cooperation with the High Priest Joshua ben Jehozadak. The absence of Zerubbabel at the dedication of the Second Temple in the sixth year of Darius (Ezra 6:13-22) should not be presumed to be his expulsion from governorship as the result of revolt. If the revolt happened in Yehud during the early reign of Darius, this man might be blamed and cursed like one of the liars as one who pretended and claimed to be the Davidic heir. Regardless of mismatched genealogies, we can still presuppose that this man—as the Davidic heir following the traditional interpretation, even if it is true—appointing royals or aristocrats

⁸⁴ Exo 20:25 order to use the uncut stone because stones are defiled when they are chiseled. cf. Deut 27:5-6; Josh 8:31.

who hold particular ethnic and regional heritages as sub-governors might be possible as the imperial strategy of colonization to exert control over its colony against all prophetic expectations. Furthermore, as we see in the case of Nehemiah (Neh 13:6) and Udjahorresnet, transferring appointments from one place to another usually happened under Persian administrations.⁸⁵

4.3.4. Infrastructural Effort

As Briant calls Darius a builder-king, this king plays a crucial role in establishing the foundation of the imperial administrative system of the Persian Empire.⁸⁶ After he had suppressed revolts in core and overall surroundings at the end of 520, he reorganized the satrapal system into twenty provinces. The satrapal system was in operation but not quite organized during the time of Cyrus and Cambyses because these two kings were focused on military expansion and its maintenance: “The only solution was the raising of taxes among the existing subjects of the Persian Empire. At the same time, Cambyses did not increase the imperial administration, either in services to encourage participation in imperial structures or in regulation to enforce compliance. This combination of responses proved unpopular; revolt was unsurprising.”⁸⁷ Darius’ satrapal reform is learning from past experience.

To be a satrap (governor), ethnicity and class matter. The satrap was chosen from among Persian royals, aristocrats and generals and appointed by the king. Herodotus gives an example of Metiochus, the son of Miltiades the Athenian general, who was married to a Persian woman.

⁸⁵ Joseph Blenkinsopp, “The Mission of Udjahorresnet and Those of Ezra and Nehemiah” *JBL* 106 (1987), 409–21.

⁸⁶ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 165.

⁸⁷ Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow*, 47.

This man was described as an honorary Persian (*Hdt.* 6.41). Even though Thomas Harrison goes further to describe this man would be one of non-Persian satraps, Herodotus is silent on that.⁸⁸ Therefore, as Briant deals with, it is safe to say that “we have an extremely rare case of a non-Persian marrying a Persian woman.”⁸⁹ Concerning the existence of sub-governorship within the satrapal administration system, it is possible to presume that even though we have poor evidence except clear case like Judah under the Babylon and Eber-Nari satrapal jurisdiction: “it is quite clear that the creation of saraphies did not cause the preexisting political entities to disappear.”⁹⁰ Here Briant presupposes that there is “considerable autonomy” would be retained “as long as they fulfilled the obligations placed on them, especially financial and military obligations” to the imperial administrations.⁹¹ In other words, locals can enjoy some level of autonomy to follow their own rules, traditions, and religious practices only if they showed their royalty to the central government: “Persian control was always present. Native officials held positions of even the smallest authority only by the choice of the imperial Persian bureaucracy; only with evidence of direct personal loyalty to Darius could any leader take any position.”⁹²

Back to Darius’ satrapal reform, Herodotus reports that he requires each satrap to pay taxes and and to contribute a fixed amount unlike Cyrus and Cambyes (*Hdt.* 3.89). Even though Herodotus devalues the two predecessors of Darius, Briant points out that the mention of Mithredath the Babylonian treasurer who served in Cyrus’s court (*Ezra* 1:8) is a definite example

⁸⁸ Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones “The First Persian Empire: 550-330 BC” in *The Great Empires of the Ancient World*. ed. Thomas Harrison (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2009), 116.

⁸⁹ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 350.

⁹⁰ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 64.

⁹¹ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 64.

⁹² Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow*, 54; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 510-511.

of how the fiscal administration works.⁹³ Nevertheless, under the reign of Darius, the fiscal administration is more systematically organized. Building and renovating administrative infrastructures like the court, temple and wall in each satrapal and even sub-satrapal capital are important steps to ensure secure control of extensive areas and to collect taxes efficiently. The exemplar of this is Darius' administrative and financial support for building the Second Temple from 520 to 515 (Ezra 6:1-15). As we discussed above, the text does not tell much about who Zerubbabel ben Shealtiel is and why he does not appear at the last scene of dedication. Nevertheless, it is clear that Darius has the favor of his people to support this building project in terms of setting up an imperial infrastructure that will serve as an administrative center provide a source of tax revenue, even if locals view this project differently, seeing it with religious and even nationalistic implications. Even though the temple does not serve as the source of tax revenue, Udjahorresnet's House of Life is a good example of how the Persian Empire turns local structures into part of the imperial infrastructure (c.f. the case of building the canal between the Nile and the Red Sea). As he did for Cambyses, Udjahorresnet continued to serve Darius. Soon Darius sent him back to the Nile Valley and ordered him to restore the House of Life, which was dedicated to Neith at Sais. Darius' purpose is not only to preserve local culture and religions, but also to implement Egyptian medical infrastructures and techniques into the Achaemenid court.⁹⁴ As he compares Nehemiah with Ezra, Blenkinsopp presupposes that that Nehemiah's journey from Egypt to Susa with a military escort is plausible, if he left Egypt with Cambyses in 522.

⁹³ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 66-67.

⁹⁴ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 473.

(See Neh 2:9; compared with Ezra 8:21-23)⁹⁵

Darius' infrastructural effort is also found in his effort to preserve local laws. Diodorus Siculus describes Darius' codification of Egyptian law as "succeeding the work of prior pharaohs such as Mneves, Sasyches, Sesotris, and Bocchoris"⁹⁶ According to Olmstead, Amasis also planned to recodify Egyptian law but failed to do so because of his death and the death of Cambyses.⁹⁷ Another piece of evidence is found in the so-called Demotic Chronicle in the third century B.C.E. in Lower Egypt. It reports Darius's edict on codification of Egyptian law into two languages (Egyptian and Assyrian/Aramaic) through local experts such as soldiers, priests and scribes.⁹⁸ From this point of view, Peter Frei continues to compare this with cases from 1) Diasporic Postexilic Jewish contexts⁹⁹ and 2) Asian Minor contexts.¹⁰⁰ Even though the difference is a matter of degree, some scholars like Joseph Blenkinsopp and Kyung-Jin Lee presuppose that the composition of Torah should be presumed to be the result of imperial authorization under the Achaemenid rule.¹⁰¹ However, as Donald B. Redford points out, unlike

⁹⁵ Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988), 168.

⁹⁶ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 477.

⁹⁷ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 142.

⁹⁸ Peter Frei, "Persian Imperial Authorization: A Summary" in *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*. ed. James W. Watts (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001), 9. Other possible examples in Egypt, see, 22-24; Dandamaev-Lukonin, 383.

⁹⁹ 1) Ezra's credentials and Nehemiah's regulations in Yehud although he does not decide whether Ezra arrived during the reign of Artaxerxes I or II; 2) the so-called Passover letter from Elephantine in Upper Egypt during the late reign of Darius I; and 3) the endorsement of the Purim regulations from the fictional story of Esther in the context of Xerxes I's reign. Frei, "Persian Imperial Authorization," 11-17.

¹⁰⁰ 1) The border dispute between Miletus and Myus around 390 B.C.E.; 2) the trilingual inscription from the Letton in Artaxerxes III Ochus (358) or IV Arsēs (337). Frei, "Persian Imperial Authorization," 18-21. Other possible examples in Asia-Minor, see, 24-29.

¹⁰¹ Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Was the Pentateuch the Civic and Religious Constitution of the Jewish Ethnos in the Persian Period?" in *Persia and Torah*, 41-62; Kyung-Jin Lee, *The Authority and Authorization of Torah in the*

Diodorus's Hellenistic description of Darius the lawgiver, the so-called Demotic Chronicle does not attempt to legislate or codify Egyptian law. Instead, it is "quite simply, the translation into Aramaic, the new language of imperial administration, of regulations governing those parts of Egyptian society productive of wealth."¹⁰² Even though the Demotic Chronicle is based on the translation of local law into *lingua franca*, it does not change Darius's authorization of local law within the imperial framework. Furthermore, if we think of how Septuagint is composed in comparison with the Masoretic text, translating into another language is not just "quite simple" work. The process of translation may imply not just mechanical verbal translation from one to the other at face value, but includes diverse variants such as utilizing multiple vorlages, adding and subtracting some lines, choosing words and phrases in the translator's context. Although it is hard to identify translation with codification in a strict sense, this process creates a third space of hybridization.

4.4. Xerxes I (r. 486-465)

4.4.1. Expeditions against Attica and Peloponnesus Regions

Achaemenid Persia had long pursued hegemony along the entire Aegean coasts beyond Asian Minor, but Attica and Peloponnesus regions were never taken by them. During the last years of his reign, Darius I continued his military expeditions to the west. The Ionian Revolt

Persian Period, CBET 64 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011); Mark G. Brett, *Locations of God: Political Theology in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 98-12.

¹⁰² Donald, B. Redford, "The So-Called "Codification" of Egyptian Law under Darius I" in *Persia and Torah* (2001) 158. Lisbeth S. Fried also follows Redford's criticism of Frei's fallacy and views the story of Ezra from the Hellenistic perspective, not the Persian one. Lisbeth S. Fried, "Did Ezra Create Judaism?," in *Marbeh Hokmah: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East in Loving Memory of Victor Avigdor Hurowitz*, ed. Jean-Claude Goyon and C. Cardin (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 171-84.

(500-493) was the first conflict between Persia and Greek world and is considered the pre-stage of the First Persian-Greek War (492-490). Even though Darius's army had some military successes in Asia Minor, Thrace and Macedonia, it failed to get Athens in the Battle of Marathon in 490. Four years later, Darius passed away and was buried at Naqsh-e Rostam. Xerxes (r. 486-465) continued his predecessor's job against the Attica and Peloponnesus regions under the control of Athens and Sparta. The Second Persian-Greek War (480-479) was waged ten years after the Battle of Marathon. Although the Persians had won the first (Thermopylae), they were defeated by Greeks in following battles on sea and land (Salamis, Mycale). This led to the founding of the Delian League along the Aegean coasts under the leadership of Athens in 478.

4.4.2. Satrapal Reorganization

Xerxes I is also known for separating the large satrapal jurisdiction of Babylon and Trans-Euphrates (Eber-Nari) into two satrapies. Perhaps this decision would be linked to “a consequence of the revolt” in Babylon which was repressed by Megabyzus (in Old Persian: Bagabukhša) in 482/1.¹⁰³ This general was the son-in-law of Xerxes, the son of Zopyrus who was the satrap of Babylon under the reign of Darius, and the grandson of Megabyzus who was one of the Seven Nobles who fought against Smerdis/Bardiya in 522. The revolt against the heavy tax burden was led by Belšimanni and Šamaš-eriba. The price of the revolt was high.¹⁰⁴ As Sennacherib did, Megabyzus's troops executed priests and plundered the temple treasury in

¹⁰³ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 243; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 544.

¹⁰⁴ Karen Radner, *A Short History of Babylon* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2020), 144.

Persepolis. Even the statue of Marduk was brought into the capital and smelted.¹⁰⁵ Since then, Babylonians have no longer considered Xerxes to be the legitimate king of the city as his predecessors were. Simultaneously, for Xerxes, it was not necessary to hold the traditional title of ‘king of Babylon’ to prove his official legitimacy as the Achaemenid king as his predecessors did. Dandamaev rightly evaluates the situation, “Babylon lost its position as a sacred city and as an important economic centre” after the revolt.¹⁰⁶ In other words, Xerxes’ policy is more favorable to Persian centralization and intensification than others. Unlike his predecessors, he withheld financial support for the locals then rather attempting to intensify all financial and administrative energies into the imperial core.¹⁰⁷ However, as Karen Radner points out, because there were no more financial favors from the core does not mean there were no more cultural practices in the local communities: “Overseen by loyal supporters of Persian rule, the temples were no longer the focal points of resistance. The cult of the old sanctuaries was not interrupted; but as the distant rulers saw little sense in funding the upkeep of the expensive shrines, the local communities had to make the cults work without the deep pockets of a royal patron.”¹⁰⁸ Since then, Yehud was under the satrapal jurisdiction of Trans-Euphrates (Eber-Nari). Ezra and Nehemiah’s activities should be considered after administrative rearrangement mentioned above.

¹⁰⁵ Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 184; Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow*, 88.

¹⁰⁶ Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 186.

¹⁰⁷ Berquist reads Malachi’s criticism over Zadokite priests in the context of Xerxes’s removal of imperial funding for the Second Temple. Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow*, 89, 93-101.

¹⁰⁸ Radner, *A Short History of Babylon*, 145.

4.5. Artaxerxes I (r. 465-424)

4.5.1. Dynastic Problems

The last we know of Xerxes I is that he was assassinated by his close associates in the royal court in August 465. Greek historians deliver diverse versions of this event with no agreement in regard to the details just as in the case of Smerdis/Bardiya.¹⁰⁹ Even modern historians have different views, and they point out several possibilities regarding who devised the plot and who practiced this murder (Darius the prince, Artaxerxes, Artabanus, and Aspamitres), what happened after the throne became empty (Artaxerxes, Artabanus, and Megabyzus the son of Zopyrus), and who Artabanus was (a Hyrcanian or an uncle of Xerxes?).¹¹⁰ If we depend too much upon Greek historiographies, we will find the story is too biased by the Greek perspective on Xerxes.¹¹¹ Nevertheless it implies that fragility of the Achaemenid dynasty and unsolvable troubles around the dynastic succession.¹¹²

4.5.2. The Revolt of Inaros, Peace of Callias and Aftermath

Inaros II, who was a Libyan who claimed to be the son of Psammetichus IV, probably linked with the old Saite line (the previous twenty-sixth dynasty), who rebelled against Persian rule in the western Delta, the Lower Egypt in 460.¹¹³ Unlike Dandamaev, who presumes there was a nationwide rebellion from Lower to the Upper Egypt (Amyrtaeus from Sais), Briant

¹⁰⁹ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 564.

¹¹⁰ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 289-90; Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 233-5.

¹¹¹ Briant even radically argues that “we must renounce, once and for all, the Greek vision of Xerxes' reign.” Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 567.

¹¹² Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 567.

¹¹³ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 303.

concludes that it is impossible to speak of “Egyptian nationalism” since it “was limited to the Delta.”¹¹⁴ Even though Inaros attempted to force out Persian tax-collectors and mercenaries, the reality was not what he expected. Still there were natives who were loyal to Persian empire in the White Wall of Memphis, the satrapal capital. This area was never taken during the siege of Memphis by the rebels who were backed up with some military aid from Athenians in 459. After Achaemenes the satrap of Egypt, who was a full brother of Xerxes I, was killed in the battlefield at Pepremis in 460/59, the rebellion was subdued by Megabyzus (the son of Zopyrus, the satrap of Eber-Nari at that time) in 456-4. This revolt clearly shows that the conflict between Persian imperialism and Athenian imperialism expanded from Aegean coasts to the Nile Delta and Syro-Palestine. In this vein, Kenneth G. Hoglund goes further to reconstruct the events. Regarding the name Doros (*Δωρος*) which appears in the Athenian Tribute Lists in the mid-fifth century, he identifies the ancient Pheonician city of Dor. According to Hoglund, when Megabyzus’ troops marched toward Delta, Syro-Palestine was encountered on the way and even may have attacked Dor.¹¹⁵ Following Hoglund’s suggestion, Charles E. Carter also sees the revolt of Inaros as the crucial junction that divides the history of Achaemenid Persia in relation to Yehud into two stages: Persian I (538-450) and Persian II (450-332).¹¹⁶ However, most Israeli scholars disagree with Hoglund-Carter’s reassessment that attempts to connect Inaros’ revolt and refortification in the Syro-Palestine region. From an archeological perspective, Oded Lipschits criticizes Hoglund

¹¹⁴ Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 238; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 575.

¹¹⁵ Kenneth G. Hoglund, *Achaemenid Imperial Administration in Syria-Palestine and the Missions of Ezra and Nehemiah* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 153-154.

¹¹⁶ Charles E. Carter, *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 27, 44.

and Carter whose assessments do not stand “the test of reality” because they incorrectly mix archeological and historiographical data.¹¹⁷ Alexander Fantalkin and Oren Tal also argue that that these are “not echoes in the archeological record.”¹¹⁸ Furthermore, the theory is rejected from the historical perspective. Ephraim Stern, in his archeological review on Dor in 1995, argues that the Carian Doros might refer to the city of the same name in Cilicia.¹¹⁹ Israel Eph'al continues,

Craterus, the early third-century collector of decrees, quoted the name of Δῶρος under the heading of ‘Carian tribute’ (Κρατικός φόρος) (FGrH 342 F 1). That this is a reference to an Athenian tribute-list seems certain, and there is something of a case for attributing it to an Athenian assessment of tribute for 454. A Carian Doros is unknown, and some authors identify this city with the port of Dor, south of the Carmel coast, on the assumption that it served the Athenian fleet as an important station en route to Egypt to help Inaros (and perhaps also Amyrtaeus) and during the fleet's sojourn there. However, this hypothesis, based as it is on toponymic identity alone, raises difficulties and should probably be rejected, on the grounds that it implies a far-reaching conclusion, namely, that the Athenians maintained a foothold for several years at a point quite far up the Palestinian coast, in a hostile region, under undisputed Persian domination and in close proximity to the main bases of the Phoenician fleets.¹²⁰

After Megabyzus' suppression of Inaros, the peace treaty was made between Athens and Persia in 449. From the point of view of ancient Greek historians (even though both pros and cons are voiced by them), it is known as the Peace of Callias since it was accomplished through a

¹¹⁷ Oded Lipschitz, “Demographic Changes in Judah between the 7th and the 5th Centuries BCE,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschitz and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 359.

¹¹⁸ Alexander Fantalkin and Oren Tal, “Redating Lachish Level I: Identifying Achaemenid Imperial Policy at the Southern Frontier of the Fifth Satrapy,” in Lipschitz and Oeming, *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, 187.

¹¹⁹ Ephraim Stern, *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, I.1* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University and Israel Exploration Society, 1995).

¹²⁰ Israel Eph'al, “Syria-Palestine under Achaemenid Rule” in *The Cambridge Ancient History, Second Edition. Volume IV: Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean. c. 525 to 479 B.C.* ed. John Boardman et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 144.

diplomatic negotiation by Callias, the Athenian politician at Susa.¹²¹ While the Delian League led by Athens promised to withdraw from Egypt, Cyprus and Trans-Euphrates, Achaemenid Persia did withdraw from Aegean coasts including guaranteeing autonomy of Ionian city-states in Asia-Minor.¹²² Even though the wars between Persia and Greece were officially ended by this treaty, the lower level of hostility, like the Cold War in our modern sense, continued afterward.¹²³

According to Greek historians, from the point of view of Amestris, the Queen-mother of Artaxerxes I, the wife of Xerxes, and the daughter of Otanes, it was not enough to soothe her rage against those who killed her son-in-law (for Ctesias, Achaemenes is her son, but that is incorrect). When Megabyzus brought the Egyptian captives, including Inaros, into Susa, this Queen-mother strongly pushed for their execution, although they already been pardoned with no execution ordered by Megabyzus. As a result, Inaros and his Greek rebels were crucified. and this made Megabyzus angry. When he went back to his Trans-Euphrates satrapy, he, with his sons and Greek mercenaries, defeated the royal troops perhaps in 449/8. Soon after this, the military tension was relieved through a diplomatic resolution between them. Megabyzus reaffirmed his loyalty to the Persian court as the satrap in Trans-Euphrates but soon after that he died in circa 440. His son Zophrus II was exiled into Athens in 445 and soon after that he, too, perished. Olmstead follows Ctesias' version literally, Dandamaev does not give Ctersias' version

¹²¹ The pros and cons concerning this treaty are well summarized by Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*. 557-558.

¹²² Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 310-11; Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 250-5; Eph'al, "Syria-Palestine under Achaemenid Rule," 144; Naoise Mac Sweeney, *Foundation Myths and Politics in Ancient Ionia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 33.

¹²³ Donald Kagan, *The Fall of the Athenian Empire* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), 17.

much credibility.¹²⁴ Briant evaluates it as “clearly a family saga.”¹²⁵ Whether or not its historicity is credible, this story implies that there was a 1) political (cooperative but conflicted) relationship between the king and an aristocrat who was a descendant of one of the conspirators in 522; 2) semi-autonomous territorial right to the Trans-Euphrates as the satrap; and 3) the first case of a revolt by a satrap after the Aryandes of Egypt and the first case to hire Greek mercenaries.¹²⁶

4.5.3. Myth of Mass Return

Artaxerxes followed his predecessor’s economic policy. To depend on and consolidate the borderline, the Persian government allowed the rebuilding of the fortification in the hill country of Yehud in 445. This building project was related to building “an effective network of Persian fortresses in the Levant and the installation of garrisons that controlled the major roads and arteries linking the Persian capital with the Mediterranean Sea” in the fifth century B.C.E.¹²⁷ As discussed above, Hoglund-Carter’s theory presents Nehemiah’s refortification in relation to the Egyptian revolt. Hoglund and Carter focus on the massive demographic changes during so-called Persian II (450-332) as the indirect archeological evidence to prove Nehemiah’s refortification.¹²⁸ However, as Lipschits argues, there are no massive returns to Jerusalem imprinted in current archaeological data. The maximum estimated population of Persian

¹²⁴ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 308; Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 244; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 577

¹²⁵ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 578.

¹²⁶ “It is true that the two interpretations (satrap; estate-holder) are not mutually exclusive, given how difficult it is to distinguish personal estates from government lands” Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 578.

¹²⁷ Eric M. Meyers and Carol L. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 25C (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 22.

¹²⁸ Hoglund, *Achaemenid Imperial Administration*, 165-205; Carter, *The Emergence of Yehud*, 249-324.

Jerusalem perhaps was only 3,000 while a rapid decrease occurred in the Benjaminite region.¹²⁹ Furthermore, “even if all of the residents of the region were among the exiles who made the return to Zion, the returnees only amounted to several thousand.”¹³⁰ In this vein, Bob Becking calls the Hoglund-Carter theory “the myth of the mass return.”¹³¹

Thus, at the beginning of the Persian period, it is probable that a few thousand of the nation’s elite, especially of the priestly caste, returned to Judah and settled in Jerusalem and its near environs. Nonetheless, the city remained poor, and the returnees found it difficult to recruit the resources and manpower required to build the Temple. Parallel to this, with the shift of the political and religious hub to Jerusalem, a rapid dwindling in population took place in the Benjaminite region. Apparently, part of the region’s inhabitants migrated out of the province, either to the Ono-Lod area or to other parts of the Shephelah, most likely the eastern sectors.¹³²

4.5.4. Dependency of Yehud upon Samaritan Adminitration?

Olmstead read Nehemiah’s refortification of Jerusalem as a defensive response against Megabyzus’ successful revolt. By observing the warning letter by Rehum the governor of

¹²⁹ This is an interesting result since minimalism highlights the role of Benjamites territory (Mizpah and Beth-El) in the fifth century. Philip R. Davies, *In Search of "Ancient Israel": A Study in Biblical Origins*, JSOTSup 148 (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1992); *The Origins of Biblical Israel*. LHBOTS 485 (New York: T&T Clark, 2007).

¹³⁰ Lipschitz, “Demographic Changes in Judah,” 365.

¹³¹ Bob Becking, “In Babylon: The Exile in Historical (Re)construction,” in *From Babylon to Eternity: The Exile Remembered and Constructed in Text and Tradition*, ed. Bob Becking, Alex Cannegieter, Wilfred van de Poll, and Anne-Mareike Wetter (New York: Routledge, 2009), 28. Similar discussion is found concerning the mass migration into Jerusalem after the fall of Samaria in the late eighth century B.C.E. Israel Finkelstein and Neil Asher Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Sacred Texts* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002); “Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, the Remaking of Judah and the Rise of the Pan-Israelite Ideology” *JSOT* 30 (2006) 259-85; Israel Finkelstein, “The Settlement History of Jerusalem in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BC” *RB* 115.4 (2008), 499-515; Nadav Na’aman, “When and How did Jerusalem Become a Great City? The Rise of Jerusalem as Judah’s Premier City in the Eighth-Seventh Century B.C.E.” *BASOR* 347 (2007), 21-5; “Dismissing the Myth of a Flood of Israelite Refugees in the Late Eighth Century BCE” *ZAW* 126.1 (2014), 1-14; Philippe Guillaume, “Jerusalem 720-705 BCE. No Flood of Israelite Refugees” *SJOT* 22 (2008), 195-211.

¹³² Lipschitz, “Demographic Changes in Judah,” 365.

Samaria and Shimshai the scribe to Artaxerxes I in Ezra 4:8-23, he presumed that Yehud was under the rule of Samaria until the mid-fifth century.¹³³ Dandamaev and Lukonin, following Alt's opinion, also described Judah as having been subordinated to the governor of Samaria since 537 B.C.E. They maintained that, during the time of Ezra-Nehemiah, Jews had self-administrative organs by priestly groups (theodicy) without any intervention or supervision from any Persian agency (compared with autonomous temple communities in Asia-Minor).¹³⁴ Joel Weinberg's model of Citizen-Temple Community (*Bürger-Tempel-Gemeinde=BTG*) is aligned with this theory of dependency of Yehud into Semarian administration. So, he sees Nehemiah as the leader of a hypothetically small theocratic (temple-centered) community, which is rooted in the infrastructural nexus of the household (*beth ab* to *beth abot*), not the official governor of Yehud.¹³⁵ While Carter agrees with Weinberg's infrastructural analysis, he strongly criticizes, following H. G. M. Williamson and P. R. Bedford, the dependency model of Yehud to Samaria.¹³⁶ From the observance of archeological artifacts (seals, coins and bullas) and

¹³³ Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 313.

¹³⁴ Dandamaev and Lukonin, *The Culture and Social Institution*, 104. See also, Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 244-249.

¹³⁵ Joel Weinberg, *The Citizen-Temple Community*, JSOTSup 151. trans. Daniel L. Smith-Christopher. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992). He argues that the Jewish household (which is called *beth ab*, the house of father) as the one basic infrastructure of society, functioned as a vehicle to preserve Jewish identity in the process of immigration and resettlement during the postexilic period. Then, "a large network of households (*beth abot*; the house of fathers) in and around Jerusalem formed a solidarity group, a "citizen-temple community." In this respect, he is focusing on the central role of the priestly group (kohen, sofer) in relation with the Temple and the Torah within this "self-governing" system. Concerning ancient Isrealite households, see also, Samuel L. Adams, *Social and Economic Life in Second Temple Judea* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 10-15; Roland Boer, *The Sacred Economy of Ancient Israel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015), 82-109.

¹³⁶ Carter, *The Emergence of Yehud*, 296-306; Peter Ross Bedford, "On Models and Texts: A Response to Blenkinsopp and Petersen," in *Persian Period*, ed. Philip R. Davies, vol. 1 of *Second Temple Studies*, JSOTSup 117 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 154-162; H. G. M. Williamson, "Judah and the Jews," in *Studies in Persian History: Essays in Memory of David M. Lewis*, ed. Amélie Kuhrt and Maria Brosius, Achaemenid History

Elephantine letters, Briant argues that the provinces of Judah and Samaria both had their own governor (as *medinah*, not satrap).¹³⁷ Briant further presumes the governmental concerns over possible troubles over Yehud; however he also argues that connecting it to international revolts should be hypothetical “since no external evidence has yet been found to confirm it.”¹³⁸

Samaria (Samerina) was provincialized since Northern Israel was invaded by Assyria in 722. At that time, the double migration happened; while some people of Israel were captured into the eastward (2Kgs 15:29; 17:6, new people were migrating to the westward (2Kgs 17:24). This caused huge demographic shifts in Samaria. When Zerubbabel did not allow Samaritans and other foreigners to join the building project of the Temple in 520, Samaritans were identifying themselves as those who brought by Esarhaddon (Ezra 4:2) and Ashurnipal (Osnappar; Ezra 4:10). As the Elephantine Letters reveal, the presence of the governor in Samaria, and the sons of Sanballat (Delaiah, Shelemiah) ruled over Samaria in the fifth and fourth centuries. Further, some Yahwistic-Hebrew names (i.e. Hannayah, Jeho'anah, Bodyah) which are found in bullae and coins with other name-types in Samaria, reveals that Yhwhism existed there in a multi-ethnic and multi-religious context.¹³⁹ This is very similar to how Babylonian Jews were integrated. Depending on the date given for building the temple of Mt. Gerizim, the relationship between Judah and Samaria is differently reconstructed. Yizhak Megen argues that the first temple at Mt. Gerizim was built in the mid-fifth century, likely before Nehemiah's first arrival in 445 B.C.E.

11 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1998), 145-63. However, recent scholars are suspicious of that. Reinhard Pummer, *The Samaritans in Flavius Josephus*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 129 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 148-152.

¹³⁷ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 488, 587. His reconstruction of the list of governors between Zerubbabel and Nehemiah: Elnathan, Yeho-ezer, and Ahzai.

¹³⁸ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 579. See also, 583-6.

¹³⁹ Cataldo, *A Theocratic Yehud?*, 74, 78.

Then, the additional temple was “built over” the first one during the reign of Antiochus III.¹⁴⁰ Concerning John Merrill’s question on Cross’ reconstruction of the Sanballat dynasty based on Wadi ed-Daliyah papyri and Josephus’s account,¹⁴¹ Megan dismisses it, saying Josephus “erred in his attribution of the temple to the time of Alexander the Great.”¹⁴² According to Reinhard Pummer, Jan Dusek reorganizes Megan into two phases of building construction; the first phase belongs to Darius III (*Ant.* XI:310-311) and the second phase belongs to Alexander the Great (*Ant.* XI:313-325).¹⁴³ For recent scholars like Megan, Dusek and Pummer, it is unreliable to follow Josephus’s statement regarding the marriage between Nicaso and Manasseh which would be from the midrash of Neh 13:28.¹⁴⁴ If we follow Dusek-Pummer’s adjustment of Megan, it is possible to say that the first phase of building Mt. Gerizim temple is no earlier than the mid-fourth century B.C.E, not the mid-fifth century B.C.E. Further, as James D. Purvis points out, the religious sect as “Samaritan” would have appeared only after the destruction of the temple by

¹⁴⁰ Yitzhak Magen, “The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim in Light of the Archaeological Evidence,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 176.

¹⁴¹ Frank Moore Cross, Jr., “Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times,” *HTR* 59 (1966) 201-11. For a fine summarized visualization of it, see Mary Joan Winn Leith, “Israel among the Nations: The Persian Period,” in *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*, ed. Michael D. Coogan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 313 (Table 8.2).

¹⁴² John Merrill, “Merrill’s Letter: Dating of Samaritan Temple on Mt. Gerizim,” provided by Biblical Archaeology Society, uploaded on Sept. 6. 2012, <https://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/scholars-study/merrills-letter/>. Yitzhak Magen, “Yitzhak Magen’s Response: Dating of the Samaritan Temple on Mt. Gerizim,” provided by Biblical Archaeology Society, uploaded on Sept. 6. 2012, <https://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/scholars-study/magens-response/>.

¹⁴³ Pummer, *The Samaritans in Flavius Josephus*, 146-47.

¹⁴⁴ Pummer, *The Samaritans in Flavius Josephus*, 150. In fact, the tendency not to give credentials on Josephus is also found in VanderKam and Grabbe. Lester L. Grabbe, “Josephus and the Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration” *JBL* 106.2 (1987) 237; James C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004) 76.

John Hyrcanus I in 112/111 B.C.E.¹⁴⁵

4.5.5. Elephantine at Syene

After Gedaliah ben Ahikam ben Shaphan (the Babylonian governor of Judah) was assassinated by Ishmael ben Nethaniah in 582, Johanan ben Kareah and the Those Who Remained were worried that Babylonians would take revenge for his death. So, they decided to run away to Egypt even though Jeremiah did not agree with their plan (taking Jeremiah with them; Jer 42-43). Further, other archeological evidence shows that there was an Egyptian Jewish diaspora in Elephantine at Syene (now, Aswan) in Upper Egypt in the fifth century B.C.E. Most of them were mercenaries who had served Egyptians from the reign of the twenty-sixth dynasty (Sais) to the twenty-seventh one (Persian Achaemenid). The mercenaries were composed of those who have various ethnic backgrounds. Jewish community in Elephantine has a religious center, which was called as “the Temple of Yaho.” The Aramean community worshipped Nabu, the Queen of Heaven, Bethel, Anath-bethel, Exhem-bethel and Herem-bethel.¹⁴⁶ So, religious practice in Jewish diaspora was syncretistic. Further, they had a land dispute with the neighboring community who worshipped Khnum, the Egyptian ram deity. So, they sent several letters to the political leaders in Yehud and Samaria in 407 B.C.E (but they did get any responses from them). This shows that they recognize Yehud and Samaria as a center of Yahwistic tradition. Eventually, after the destruction in 410, the Temple of Yaho was rebuilt and they agreed not to offer animal sacrifices.

¹⁴⁵ James D. Purvis, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*. HSM 2 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 118.

¹⁴⁶ Cataldo, *A Theocratic Yehud?*, 81.

4.5.6. Theocratic Yehud?

Before he served as governor (*pehah*) in Yehud (Neh 5:14, e.g. Sheshbazzar in Ezra 5:16; Zerubbabel in Hag 1:1, 14; 2:2, 21), Nehemiah was a cup-bearer for the Artaxerxes I in Susa (Neh 2:1). As in the case of Darius as a lance-bearer before he became a king, this title might just describe functional, administrative duties rather than anything more in the Persian court.¹⁴⁷

After the Second Temple had been built, the role of the priestly group became more crucial in terms of administration and jurisdiction than was the political group. Depending on how to view the relationship between the core and (sub)periphery, the characteristics of Yehud administration are defined. For example, as we discussed above, Weinberg's model is a typical example of an internally autonomous and self-governing system from the core. Dandamaev, agreeing with Tadmor and Machinist, that Persian Yehud was a self-governing theocratic city while "the Persian satrap did not interfere into the internal affairs of this community."¹⁴⁸ Lisbeth S. Fried, following Shmuel N. Eisenstadt's model of bureaucratic empires, disagrees with the theory of self-governance. Instead, he argues that temple elites were under the control of Achaemenid administrations, "all power was in the hands of the king and his representatives."¹⁴⁹ Jeremiah W. Cataldo also stands with this line of thought. However, he misidentifies Briant's internal autonomy with Dandamaev's idea of self-governing (which Fried criticizes).¹⁵⁰ Even

¹⁴⁷ For example, Hanani the brother of Nehemiah (Neh 1:2).

¹⁴⁸ Dandamaev, "Achaemenid Imperial Policies and Provincial Governments" *Iranica Antiqua*, 34 (1999), 273. He continues, "It goes without saying that the dependence of the subjects of various regions of the empire on central power was not the same but on the whole the Persian administration made no attempts to establish a total control over the population at all. Such a control would have contracted traditional social institutions and popular psychology." 280.

¹⁴⁹ Fried, *The Priest and the Great King*, 6.

¹⁵⁰ Cataldo, *A Theocratic Yehud?*, 45.

though Briant agrees with “internal autonomy” in the Jewish community, it does not mean “self governing” without any jurisdiction.¹⁵¹ Therefore Briant considers “autonomy” as follows; “In a way, from the perspective of the rulers of local communities (ethnos, city, sanctuary), the label ‘royal law,’ far from being considered a limitation on their autonomy, constituted a sort of royal guarantee against satrapal arbitrariness.”¹⁵² Nevertheless, as Cataldo rightly points out, Yehud was not theocratic, in other words, not a self-governing without any jurisdiction from the center.¹⁵³ Therefore, even though the Temple was under the supervision of the priestly group, the Temple functioned as the center of tax revenue (fiscal administration) for serving interests of the Persian Empire; collecting, accumulating and sending it to the core as Joachim Schaper argues.¹⁵⁴

It was clear the reason why Cyrus II was allowed to worship local deities and Darius I financially supported the building of local temples. They knew that the temple functioned as the ideological and economic center of every culture. Therefore, while they ensured some tolerances to protect local customs, they made a demand to show their loyalty in the way of taxation, gifts, tributes, military service, and even labor. The parallel between Udjahorresnet and Ezra-Nehemiah could be explained in this way. Like Udjahorresnet’s works to preserve Egyptian customs were practiced under the order of Darius I, Ezra and Nehemiah’s roles were also deeply connected with interests of Persian courts. Evidence of other Jewish diasporas from outside of Yehud also show that they served the interests of the central government while they preserved

¹⁵¹ Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 510-11.

¹⁵² Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 511.

¹⁵³ Cataldo, *A Theocratic Yehud?*, 37, 68.

¹⁵⁴ Joachim Schaper, “The Jerusalem Temple as an Instrument of the Achaemenid Fiscal Administration” *VT* 45.4 (1995), 528-539.

their identity.

However, it is debatable which scribal tradition is responsible for the formation of Ezra-Nehemiah (aligned with the composition of Chronicler's History and Pentateuch during the Second Temple period) in relation to the socio-political structure of mid-fifth century Persian Yehud. Recently, it is found that Kyung-Jin Min's and Jae-Young Jeon's emphasis on the Levitical scribal tradition in the mid-fifth century served as a counter-tradition of the hegemonic Zadokite/Aaronite.¹⁵⁵

4.5.7. Ezra and Nehemiah

Those who are following Duhmian reconstructions are making positive links between Trito-Isaiah's calling back to the pious religious manner and reforms made under Ezra and Nehemiah. However, concerning dating the period of Ezra and Nehemiah, it is necessary to consider several complicated dating issues such as how to date Ezra between 458 and 398 concerning the "seventh year of Artaxerxes" and how to estimate Nehemiah's second arrival in relation with his on-leave after the first term (445-433).¹⁵⁶ Whether or not Ezra is arrived in the seventh year of Artaxerxes I or Artaxerxes II, Trito-Isaiah does not mention of the important keyword Torah at least once unlike the case of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 42:4, 21, 24; 51:4, 7) even though he shares some of the Deutero-Isaian language. Even if we presuppose that Mosaic Torah

¹⁵⁵ Kyung-Jin Min, *The Levitical Authorship of Ezra-Nehemiah*, LHBTS 409 (New York: T&T Clark, 2004); Jaeyoung Jeon, "The Zadokite and Levite Scribal Conflicts and Hegemonic Struggles" in *Scripture as Social Discourse: Social-Scientific Perspectives on Early Jewish and Christian Writings* (New York: T&T Clark, 2017), 97-110.

¹⁵⁶ Bright gives a fine summary on this issue. John Bright, *A History of Israel*, third edition (Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1981), 391-402.

functions as the whole framework of the final form of the Book of Isaiah, the formation of Trito-Isaiah should be prior to this final stage.

Moreover, it is not just an issue about whether the prophet was acting before or after Nehemiah's arrival as Duhm suggests. Nehemiah's socio-religious reform happens after his second term of the governorship has begun (Neh 13:6-7). If we connect this with Trito-Isaiah's emphasis on religious purity in terms of reconsolidating Jewish identity, it should be inferred that this prophet would be acting at least until the 430s. If we see Trito-Isaiah as the opposite side of the mainstream who speak up for inclusion of pious non-Jews converts, we face the same problem because the text is silent on the issue of exogamy. Whether or not our protagonist is aligned with the mainstream in the mid- or late-fifth century, we have general agreement that Ezra and Nehemiah share the same priestly ideology with Chroniclers. Even if we say that, at some point it is necessary to reconsider the socio-historical position of those who were responsible for the formation of these historiographical materials. Furthermore, we face how close to or far from Deuteronomistic History these Chroniclers are.¹⁵⁷ These variables make it difficult to date Trito-Isaiah in the mid- or late-fifth century B.C.E.

¹⁵⁷ For a typical example focusing on the continuity between Chr and DtrH, see John C. Endres, S. J. William R. Millar, and John Barclay Burns, eds., *Chronicles and Its Synoptic Parallels in Samuel, Kings, and Related Biblical Texts* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998): Contra and Auld highlight discontinuity. A. Graeme Auld, "What If the Chronicler Did Use the Deuteronomistic History?" *BibInt* 8 (2000): 137-50.

4.6. Reconstructing Social Setting of Trito-Isaiah

4.6.1. Two Priestly Groups: Enfranchised v. Disenfranchised (Plöger-Hanson)

The theory of two priestly groups within the post-exilic community is introduced by Otto Plöger's work *Theokratie und Eschatologie* in 1959 (trans. 1968). He distinguishes the Zadokite priestly group and the prophetic group who were holding eschatological visions. Based on the deprivation theory, the prophetic group desires a better future in their conventicles through imagining either an apocalyptic or eschatological vision (Isa 24-27; Joel 3-4; Zech 12-14, Daniel). This logic was connected with the dichotomy between the Sadducees and the Hasidim (later, Pharisees) during the Maccabean revolt.¹⁵⁸ Paul D. Hanson, from his work *The Dawn of Apocalypse* in 1975 (revised in 1979) reconstructs the *Sitz im Leben* of Isa. 56-66 (as the works by the visionary disciples of Deutero-Isaiah) and Zech. 9-14 (as the works by the later successor of the visionary tradition with the completion of book-ends of Trito-Isaiah) within the theocratic Yehud, while he presumes that the final form of Trito-Isaiah had been composed by a long transmissional process.¹⁵⁹ For doing this, he applies and develops Plöger's theory, with the dualistic sociological research of Max Weber, Karl Mannheim and Ernest Troeltsch on the conflict between the ruling class or not within the modern European context.¹⁶⁰ He identifies the marginalized apocalyptic visionaries with Abiatharite Levites who ruled out the priestly services in the First Temple (1Kings 2:26-27). In this vein, this group's theology is contrasted with what

¹⁵⁸ Otto Plöger, *Theology and Eschatology*, trans. S. Rudman (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968). Originally published in German in 1959.

¹⁵⁹ He divided the development of postexilic apocalyptic movements in three stages. Paul D. Hanson, "Apocalypticism" in *IBDSup* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1976), 32-33.

¹⁶⁰ Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*, revised edition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 211-220.

Ezek. 40-49 envisioned for the future temple with the Zadokites (Ezek 40-49) and what Haggai and Zechariah (Zech 1-8) imagined for the theocratic ruler.¹⁶¹ Hanson describes this minor line of thought as being oppressed and excommunicated by the major one, also it felt alienated from the dominant society.¹⁶² Hanson's idea is accredited and subscribed to by William L. Holladay, Elizabeth Actemeir (1982) and Walter Bruggemann (1998). R. P. Carroll (1979) also agrees that, even though this is too early to say that the dawn of the apocalyptic appeared in the postexilic context, the twilight of prophecy could be also "the first glimmer in the dawn of apocalyptic."¹⁶³ However, Carroll criticizes Hanson's presupposition that apocalyptic utopians do not have much interest in ideological concerns.

...where the defects of his presentation become important is at the centre of his thesis where he polarizes the post-exilic community into two groups, ideological and utopian. Although his sociological analysis is an advance on other treatments of the material it does involve him in the defects of his sources. The separation of utopia and ideological does not necessarily mean that the utopian lacked an ideology - there are a number of senses in which social scientists use ideology, of which one is certainly Hanson's system of ideas aimed at maintaining the power structures. Utopians also have an ideology, a system of ideas, though not one devoted to maintaining the power structures of the community.¹⁶⁴

Plöger-Hanson's theory is challenged by many scholars because it is failing to deal equivalently with the priestly tradition, relying too much on the researcher's own speculation regarding the origin of the apocalyptic. Even though Cook's prescription of Hanson as a mixture of cognitive dissonance and deprivation theory is partly right and partly wrong, his observation is

¹⁶¹ Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 221-8; *The People Called: The Growth of Community in the Bible* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1986), 253-290.

¹⁶² Hanson, "Apocalypticism," 32.

¹⁶³ Robert P. Carroll, "Twilight of Prophecy or Dawn of Apocalyptic?" *JSOT* 14 (1979), 31.

¹⁶⁴ Robert P. Carroll, *When Prophecy Failed: Cognitive Dissonance in the Prophetic Traditions of the Old Testament* (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), 210.

a crucial turning point that makes Plöger-Hanson's theory of early apocalypticism vice versa from disenfranchised groups to enfranchised groups.¹⁶⁵

4.6.2. Three Priestly Groups (Cook's revision)

Steven L. Cook reevaluates and takes up Plöger-Hanson's theory. Although he accepts the sociological approaches to trace back and reconstruct the early history of Jewish apocalypticism (esp. proto-apocalypse), he disagrees with Plöger and Hanson's model of deprivation. He argues that apocalypticism or millennialism can be explained not only by those who are deprived, but also by those who belong to the core who experience some level of cognitive dissonance. In his 1995 work, Cook proposes the diversity of Jewish apocalypticism by analyzing Ezek 38-39, First Zechariah, and Joel. He did not delve deeply into Trito-Isaiah. Rather, he seems to reserve his judgment on Hanson's theory of the Trito-Isaiah as the peripheral/marginalized group.¹⁶⁶ In this respect, Berquist also points out that a Jerusalemite scribe was someone in the middle-class who experienced relative deprivation.¹⁶⁷

Cook's reconstruction of Trito-Isaiah appeared in his articles published over several years in 2004, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2018.¹⁶⁸ This is connected with his project to reconstruct the

¹⁶⁵ Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism*, 57, 214. To add this, Sweeney continues that "it is the work of priestly circles who employed the images and concepts of the heavenly realm made manifest in the Temple to articulate their understandings of the times in which they lived." Sweeney, *Form and Intertextuality*, 7.

¹⁶⁶ Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism*, 57.

¹⁶⁷ Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow*, 185.

¹⁶⁸ Stephen L. Cook and Corrine L. Patton, "Introduction: Hierarchical Thinking and Theology in Ezekiel's Book," in *Ezekiel's Hierarchical World: Wrestling with A Tiered Reality*, ed. Stephen L. Cook and Corrine L. Patton (Atlanta: SBL Press: 2004), 1-26; Cook, "Apocalyptic Prophecy" in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 19-35; "Second Isaiah and the Aaronide Response to Judah's Forced Migrations," in *The Prophets Speak on Forced Migration*, ed. Mark J. Boda et al.

exilic and post-exilic priestly traditions in relation to the Book of Ezekiel. He, following Israel Knohl's distinction between the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School (c.f. Milgrom's model of JEPHD), distinguishes the postexilic priestly traditions in three sects based on the Damascus Document, CD 4's interpretation of Ezek 44:15; 1) Aaronides/Ithamarites (*kohanim*); 2) Zadokites/Eleazarites (*benei zadok*); and 3) Levites (*levi'im*).

While Zadokite priests stand with the hierarchical worldview from the sources of the Holiness School (HS; Ezekiel, Zechariah), Aaronide priests (descendants of Ithamar; *kohanim*), based on the Priestly Torah sources (PT), understand "Israel's official priests as all the living descendants of Aaron."¹⁶⁹ Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah belong to the Aaronides.¹⁷⁰ Because they take universal and inclusive positions, they were not much interested in hierarchy. Although the ambiguous syntax in Isa 66:21 may refer to "the ordination of returning lay Israelites," he prefers to consider it a more radical understanding to open the door to foreigners.¹⁷¹ Further, the Isaian Aaronide will "overturn the Levitical covenant's permanence and exclusivity (Jer 33:20-21),¹⁷² while Levitical authors of Malachi deal with issues of the Levitical covenant associated with the purging (not terminating) of current post-exilic temple staff after the dedication of the Temple.¹⁷³ Cook, however, does not contextualize Trito-Isaiah to a particular socio-historical setting.

(Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 47-62; "Prophecy and Apocalyptic," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Prophets*, ed. Carolyn J. Sharp (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 67-86; *Ezekiel 38-48: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 22B (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018).

¹⁶⁹ Cook and Patton, "Introduction," 4.

¹⁷⁰ Cook, "Second Isaiah and the Aaronide Response," 47-62; "Prophecy and Apocalyptic," 67-86.

¹⁷¹ Cook, "Prophecy and Apocalyptic," 73.

¹⁷² Cook, "Prophecy and Apocalyptic," 75.

¹⁷³ Cook, "Prophecy and Apocalyptic," 78.

In fact, even though Cook dismisses disenfranchised millennial groups, Cook's designation of Trito-Isaiah as Ithmarites/Abiatharites is not much different from what Hanson does.¹⁷⁴ However, Cook does see this group as Aaronic instead of Levitic, as Stephen Hultgren rightly problematizes.¹⁷⁵ The problem is, the designation of "Aaronic" is very ambiguous. Sometime it encompasses Eleazar (Zadok) and Ithamar (Abiathar) simultaneously (Exo 6:23; Lev 10:16; Num 3:4, 26:60-61; 1Chr 6:3, 24:1-4) while it is limited to *benei zadok* only (1Chr. 6:49-53; c.f. 1Kgs 2:26-35). Cook defines Aaronides as a broad nuance including Ithamarites/Abiathariates, but Min and Jeon use this term with identifying *bnei-aharon* as showing the way of the privileged position of Eleazarites/Zadokites during the post-exilic time.¹⁷⁶ If the tradition of Aaronides/Ithamarites was equivalent with the Priestly Torah, how do we solve the problem of Jeremiah's hostile attitude toward those priestly groups who were keeping the priestly Torah (Jer 18:18)?¹⁷⁷

4.6.3. Two Religious Groups: Yahwistic Separatists and Syncretic Assimilationists (Smith-Schramm)

Morton Smith redescribes the cult of YHWH by using the concept of acculturation from the pre-exilic period to the post-exilic period. For him, there were two contradictory religious

¹⁷⁴ Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 270-271

¹⁷⁵ Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 210. (footnote, 200).

¹⁷⁶ Min, *The Levitical Authorship*, 63-65. Jeon, "The Zadokite and Levite Scribal Conflicts," 97-110.

¹⁷⁷ Concerning the formation of the ancient priesthood, it is possible to retrospect its origin to link with pre-exilic sanctuaries (Shechem, Bethel, Beer-Shevah, Dan, Gilgal, Shiloh, Gibeon, Hebron and Jerusalem under Jebusites and after) but it is ruled out in this paper since it is not our main concern. More discussions on history of research on Zadokite priesthood, Alice Hunt, *Missing Priests: The Zadokites in Tradition and History*. LHBOTS 452 (New York: T&T Clark: 2006).

parties between the YHWH-alone party and the syncretic party. Even though the former one had been patronized by the royals, the latter one was more popular in the daily life of Israelite-Canaanite culture until the pre-exilic period: “In spite of Yahwist revolutions of the ninth century, the cult of the various Baals continued...syncretism was dominant in the cult of Yahweh at Jerusalem to the very last day of the First Temple.”¹⁷⁸ In other words, his logic is based on the formation of ancient Israelite monotheism in relation to Mesopotamian culture.¹⁷⁹ He presumes that the syncretic cult of YHWH had survived as a result of the demographic mixture after 587/6, while the upper-class leaders of the YHWH-alone party were carried off to Babylon with preserving their power and wealth.¹⁸⁰ From Smith’s point of view, most of the denunciations of Palestine were delivered by the Babylonian YHWH-alone returnees: “Consequently we should expect that the upper-class leaders of the Yahweh-alone party in Babylonia would lose touch with the Judean lower class.”¹⁸¹ All post-exilic writers, including Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah both, are listed in this category, as those books written exclusively by returned elites who lost their social connection with hybridized natives in Persian Yehud.¹⁸² He presumes that the proselytism

¹⁷⁸ Morton Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 23, 25. In this vein, he regards pre-exilic prophetic judgmental criticisms against syncretism as “interpretation.” 26-7.

¹⁷⁹ Mark S. Smith discusses the Canaanite origin of ancient Israelite monotheism. Mark S. Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

¹⁸⁰ Smith, *Palestinian Parties*, 82-3.

¹⁸¹ Smith, *Palestinian Parties*, 100.

¹⁸² Most post-exilic political and priestly groups were considered to be separatists because they were strongly holding with the YHWH-alone cult (Zerubbabel, Joshua, Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra, Nehemiah, Shecaniah ben Jehiel), but others who collaborated with neighboring rulers through mixed marriages were identified as assimilationist (Eliashib, Joiada).

in Isa 56:1-7 is suggested to solve the problem of inter-marriage in Ezra-Nehemiah. In other words, these two texts are not contradictory but complementary according to Smith.

That the aliens involved in the mixed marriages might become proselytes—that is, might accept the obligations of the law and also receive its benefits, including purification—was something Ezra never considered. Nor was it considered in Nehemiah's time. But the idea was apparently introduced during Nehemiah's governorship, by the author Isaiah 56:1-7, who announced it as a new revelation. He attempted to moderate between the parties...By thus developing the concept "proselyte," the assimilationist priesthood proposed to settle by compromise the problem of mixed marriages: the separatist's concern for purity and observance of the law would be satisfied, but the marriages could be tolerated. Ultimately, though not without opposition, the compromise prevailed. But individual proselytism was not sufficient to undo the damage which the separatist party had done in cutting Judea off from Samaria and so separating the two largest Palestinian groups of the worshippers of Yahweh.¹⁸³

Brooks Schramm's basic thesis is similar to what Smith suggests. Like Hanson and Smith, Trito-Isaiah is considered as the continuation of the Deutro-Isaian tradition and its setting is viewed as a conflict between two religious parties. Following Smith, he presumes that this bipartisan tradition between the YHWH-alone party and syncretists had been continued from the pre-exilic period.¹⁸⁴ In this respect, his criticism of Hanson is acute and keen.. His main criticism is that Hanson fails to figure out Trito-Isaiah's priestly characteristics while he too holds a speculative theory of disenfranchised Levites visionaries. Back to traditional ideas of Duhm and Eliger, Schramm sees Trito-Isaiah as belonging to the mainline priestly tradition, as "a forerunner of the priestly document" like Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Ezra.¹⁸⁵ To support his thesis, he is generally dependent on Smith's thesis with some modifications. First, he does not

¹⁸³ Smith, *Palestinian Parties*, 181-2.

¹⁸⁴ Schramm, *The Opponents*, 179, 181.

¹⁸⁵ Schramm, *The Opponents*, 113. Contrast with Hanson, Robert R. Wilson identifies Ezekiel as the peripheral prophet rejected by the orthodox Zadokite community. Robert R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 285.

specify the precise date of Trito-Isaiah in Nehemiah's time nor does he set any dates: "It may be that anything approaching a precise dating of this material will forever remain an impossibility."¹⁸⁶ Second, he does not follow the Samaritan sectarian hypothesis because of its anachronism.¹⁸⁷ Third, he rightly points out that Isa 56:3-8 is concerned with foreign men, while Ezra-Nehemiah is concerned with foreign women.¹⁸⁸ In other words, the issues of proselytism and inter-marriage should not be mixed.¹⁸⁹ Finally, unlike Smith who views the post-exilic priestly group as having excluded Palestine natives, Schramm claims that traditional members of the YHWH-alone party were excluded from the syncretic native community.

It is this that gives the cutting-edge to the oracles of Third Isaiah, in that it is precisely traditional members of the people Israel who are being excluded from the community ... Third Isaiah goes beyond Second Isaiah, though, in that Third Isaiah redefines YHWH's people as those who abstain from various kinds of traditional, syncretistic cultic acts. This redefinition was to become complete with the promulgation of the priestly Pentateuch. The Pentateuch enshrined once and for all time the theological convictions of Second Isaiah and elucidated how the faithful follower of YHWH is to worship him properly. Once this interpretive move had taken place, it can be said, at least theoretically, that 'Israel' ceased to be 'a national-ethnic entity' and became 'a confessional community'. The oracles of Third Isaiah are to be seen as playing an integral role in this process.¹⁹⁰

However, as Cataldo points out, Smith-Schramm's two-party theory is too focused on religious dynamics centered only in Jerusalem, so it dismisses demographic dynamics created by diasporic immigration. Furthermore, Schramm's treatment of the traditional YHWH-alone party, who returned from Babylonia, would not be considered a minority if we consider that most of

¹⁸⁶ Schramm, *The Opponents*, 15-16, 52.

¹⁸⁷ Schramm, *The Opponents*, 73.

¹⁸⁸ Schramm, *The Opponents*, 123 (footnote, 6).

¹⁸⁹ Marvin A. Sweeney, *Isaiah 40-66*. FOTL (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016), 254.

¹⁹⁰ Schramm, *The Opponents*, 181-2.

them were serving the Achimenid administration: “There is no evidence proving that the cult governed the province or even that the Empire granted the city of Jerusalem autonomy.”¹⁹¹

4.6.4. Class Mobility: *Haredim* from Disfranchised to Enfranchised (Blenkinsopp’s revision)

Blenkinsopp notes the repetitive mention of *haredim* (those who tremble at YHWH’s word) in Isa 66:2, 5; Ezra 9:4 and 10:3. He views this group as an early form of Jewish sectarian community in Persian Yehud even though there is no connection with later sects like the Pharisees or Essenes.¹⁹² Relying on Weber, Troeltsch and Talmon, Blenkinsopp’s approach seems like hybridization of Plöger-Hanson’s disenfranchised model and Smith-Schramm’s YHWH-alone group against syncretic groups.¹⁹³ With respect to various redactional layers with thematic continuity within the final form of the Book of Isaiah, the tremblers (*haredim*) in Isa. 66:2, 5 are identified as the disciples of Deutero-Isaiah, who is responsible for 52:13-53:12.¹⁹⁴ This group “had been excommunicated by the authorities on account of their apocalyptic belief in an imminent divine intervention, or at least their exclusive claim to vindication when that happened.”¹⁹⁵ He dates most of Trito-Isaiah to the reign of Darius I except in the cases of 65:17-

¹⁹¹ Cataldo, *A Theocratic Yehud?*, 116-7.

¹⁹² Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66*, 52; *Essays on Judaism in the Pre-Hellenistic Period*. BZAW 495 (Berlin: De Gruyter), 201.

¹⁹³ Blenkinsopp, “A Jewish Sect of the Persian Period” *CBQ* 52.1 (1990), 5-20.

¹⁹⁴ Blenkinsopp, “The Servant and the Servants in Isaiah and the Formation of the Book” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*, vol. 1, 167, 170; *Isaiah 40-55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 19A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 85, 356, 366.

¹⁹⁵ Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55*, 80; *Isaiah 56-66*, 52.

25 and 66:1-4.¹⁹⁶ Here his reconstruction of *golah* tremblers in Trito-Isaiah is very similar to what Plöger and Hanson suggest. While he agrees with the disenfranchised social location of the apocalyptic prophetic group, he does not see them within the conflict inside the postexilic priestly community. As Smith and Schramm do, he sees that all post-exilic writings are critical of syncretistic practices in Persian Yehud.¹⁹⁷ However, for Blenkinsopp, syncretism is definitely caused not by insiders but by outsiders, which means non-Yahwistic pagans.¹⁹⁸ Based on this logic, the condemnation against the temple priesthood is caused by concerns against cultural hybridization by exogamy. Therefore, he has no need to review and discuss the origin of syncretism within Yahwistic religions historically and geographically since this conflict is simplified into tension between insider and outsider. Then, he turns his attention to how the social position of *golah* tremblers had been changed from disenfranchised to enfranchised. This shift happens during the reign of Artaxerxes I. Under the leadership of Shecaniah ben Jehiel (Ezra 10:3), those tremblers performed dominant social roles in Yehud society by being aligned with Ezra's reforms with the observance of the divine covenant (*berit*), instruction (*torah*) and commandments (*mitzvot*).¹⁹⁹ In fact, Blenkinsopp's reconstruction of this ancient hypothetical group is rooted in those groups that stress the experience of "uncontrollable trembling" like Quakers, Shakers and the ultra-orthodox Jews (*haredim* nowadays) on the East-Coast.²⁰⁰ We can get some knowledge on those religious phenomena from anthropological and socio-

¹⁹⁶ Blenkinsopp, "Trito-Isaiah (Isaiah 56-66) and the *Gōlāh* Group of Ezra, Shecaniah, and Nehemiah (Ezra 7-Nehemiah 13): Is there a connection?" *JSOT* 43.4 (2019), 676-677.

¹⁹⁷ Blenkinsopp, "Trito-Isaiah (Isaiah 56-66) and the *Gōlāh* Group," 669-675.

¹⁹⁸ Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66*, 268-273, 278, 281, 297-8.

¹⁹⁹ Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 188-9.

²⁰⁰ Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, IBC (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990), 67; *Isaiah 56-66*, 52.

psychological perspectives, however Blenkinsopp did not address this as much as Festinger, Carroll and Cook do.

4.6.5. Two Geo-religious Groups: Judahites Criticism against Exilic Leadership (Tiemeyer's revision)

Smith-Schramm's theory is modified and reversed by Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer. As previous scholars agree, she also regards Trito-Isaiah as the one who stands for Deutero-Isaianic traditions but is critical of priestly traditions. However, although Cook and Schramm do, she does not agree with the model of deprivation that Plöger, Hanson and Blenkinsopp hold. Instead she is more focused on the geo-religious aspects of the conflicts around post-exilic Yehud: "the identification of the prophet's opponents with the clergy must be placed in the wider context of post-exilic prophecy in general."²⁰¹ Following Barstad's assumption of the geographical background of Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah (with redactional concerns about what she calls "gradual growth"), she does not accept the traditional views on the Babylonian-based authorship of the Second Isaiah. Instead, she argues that all chapters of Second and Third Isaiah were written in Judah/Palestine.²⁰² However, it is necessary to make a clarification on her use of "Judah."

In contrast, the term "Judah" denotes not only the pre-exilic kingdom of Judah, but also the geographical territory with the same name under Neo-Babylonian rule, as well as the later province of Yehud under Persian rule. In those cases where I wish to refer to the territory of Judah in the specific time period between 586 BC–520 BC, I shall use the

²⁰¹ Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage*, 15.

²⁰² Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, *For the Comfort of Zion: The Geographical and Theological Location of Isaiah 40-55*. VTSup 139 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 34-35; "Continuity and Discontinuity in Isaiah 40-66" in *Continuity and Discontinuity*, 24-25. See also, Barstad, *The Babylonian Captivity*, 93.

term “templeless Judah”. Although there is some evidence of continuous worship in the ruined temple in Jerusalem (Jer 41:5), and although there might have existed functioning sanctuaries in Judah during this time period (Zech 7:3), this term denotes the years between the fall of the central temple in Jerusalem in 586 BC and the beginning of the rebuilding of the same temple in 520 BC.²⁰³

Holding this Judahite provenance theory, Tiemeyer does not believe the Deutero-Isaianic hope of returning exiles would not serve as historical evidence of the physical return from Babylon to Jerusalem in the late sixth century. Instead, the textual description of Zion in Deutero-Isaiah would be identical with the “earthly city of Jerusalem and its population” including the inhabitants of temples of Judah and some of the earliest returning exiles.²⁰⁴ However, her portrayal of the Babylonian provenance in Deutero-Isaiah has critical problems when compared with her earlier work of Trito-Isaiah.²⁰⁵ Tiemeyer’s redactional proposals of Trito-Isaiah are connected with her reconstruction of the dynamics of geo-religious groups. Basically, her redactional scheme agrees with what Stromberg suggests later, but it different in details. 1) chs. 60-62 and 63:1-6 are considered to be the earliest materials (shortly after 539 BCE); 2) 56:9-59-21 and 65:1-66:17 are dated around 520 BCE; 3) the lament in 63:7-64:11 is probably originated from the exilic or the early post-exilic period; and 4) Isa 56:1-8 and 66:18-24 are added as the framework into the corpus of Trito-Isaiah, but the first one is earlier.²⁰⁶ As Smith and Schramm view this history, all post-exilic writers (Haggai and Zechariah, 520-518; Malachi, 520-450; Ezra, 458; Nehemiah, 445) are aligned with Trito-Isaiah’s prophetic criticism

²⁰³ Tiemeyer, *For the Comfort of Zion*, 20.

²⁰⁴ Tiemeyer, *For the Comfort of Zion*, 265. However, she is hesitant to deal with the issue of immigration, demographic and archeological issues much while she is continuing to question the geographical address of the second part of the Book of Isaiah.

²⁰⁵ Tiemeyer, *For the Comfort of Zion*, 130.

²⁰⁶ Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage*, 85; Stromberg, *Isaiah After Exile*, 11-39.

against unorthodox priestly worship.²⁰⁷ She argues that, except in the case of chs. 60-62, most of the authors of Trito-Isaiah were considered as critical voices against the unorthodox worship (lack of knowledge, social injustice, syncretism, intermarriage, foreign alliance, cultic neglect, and impurity) of Judahite priesthood: “In these chapters (chs. 60-62), a very early post-exilic prophet envisioned a priesthood that differed from that of pre-exilic Judah and Israel, a priesthood that encompasses every Judahite rather than only a restricted elite (who has exilic origin) (parenthesis are mine)”²⁰⁸ As Hanson and Smith do, she views the core theme of chs. 60-62 as it is continued in surrounding chapters in Trito-Isaiah with (redactional) modifications such as including proselytes in 56:6-7 and further God-fearing gentiles among divine priests in 66:20-21. In her later article in 2014, she more clearly specified who is meant by “a restricted elite.”

Although it is unclear to what extent these depictions correspond with historical reality, it is difficult to escape the impression that the leadership in Yehud in the early post-exilic period consisted primarily of people who had arrived from Babylon. It is possible that some of the people in leadership positions, especially some of the clergy, were from among the people who had remained in the land, yet it is unreasonable to assume that they formed the majority. With this in mind, we can conclude that the critique of the leadership in Isaiah 56–66 chiefly targeted people who had returned from Babylon rather than people belonging to the indigenous Judahite community.²⁰⁹

Here we realize that Smith-Schramm’s model is totally reversed. While Babylonian returnees are blamed because of their unorthodox practices, Judahite prophets claim to return to the orthodox traditions. Even though she admits the continuity of syncretism from pre-exilic

²⁰⁷ Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage*, 84, 182. (footnote, 5).

²⁰⁸ Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage*, 288.

²⁰⁹ Tiemeyer, “Hope and Disappointment: The Judahite Critique of the Exilic Leadership in Isaiah 56-66” in *New Perspectives on Old Testament Prophecy and History*, 72-73.

contexts, she put it together with the problem of those who hold the legitimacy of the Second Temple in Jerusalem.²¹⁰ Even though she rejects Hanson's deprivation model, it raises the question of why she never posits those Judahite prophetic writers as constituting the political or priestly leadership even before the returning Babylonian exiles. Although she does not envision class mobility as Blenkinsopp did, it is not enough to explain the sociological background of why Judahite writers changed their expectations about returning exiles from positive to negative.²¹¹ Therefore, it is necessary to figure out Trito-Isaiah in dialogic reading not only with exilic leadership but also with Those Who Remained (in terms of Rom-Shiloni) who had survived and preserved their collective memory during and after the templeless period.

4.6.6. Three Social Groups: Immigrants' (Politicians, Priests) Interplays against Yehud Natives (Berquist)

Earlier than Barstad and Tiemeyer, Berquist already noticed the importance of a spatial reading of Trito-Isaiah. According to his perspective, Persian Yehud society around 520 BCE is clearly divided into the upper and lower classes which are identified as immigrants (from Babylon) and natives (in Palestine), elites and peasants, and urban and rural people.²¹² Since the material culture and its economy is centered around the Temple, desires and struggles to rebuild

²¹⁰ Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage*, 171; Tiemeyer, "Hope and Disappointment," 60.

²¹¹ "Phrased differently, given the fact that the material, in its final form, constitutes one book, the people who authored its various parts are likely to have belonged to a shared tradition and to have held compatible theologies...The authors of Isaiah 40–55 anticipated the return of the exiles with joy. The later authors of Isaiah 56–59; 65–66 expressed their disappointment with those same exiles with bitterness and grief." Tiemeyer, "Hope and Disappointment," 72-3.

²¹² Berquist, "Reading Difference in Isaiah 56-66: The Interplay of Literary and Sociological Strategies" *MTSR* 7.1. (1995), 35, 38.

the temple not only suggest religious passions but also imply economic “conflicts of power inherent” between these two groups.²¹³ The immigrant class is more subdivided into political groups (royal court officials and merchants) and priestly groups. Minor tension is also found between these subdivisions because of different perspectives and interests in details.²¹⁴

In reality, the priestly immigrants and the political immigrants form an uneasy coalition, and the text of Isaiah 56-66 details the growth and basis of that alliance. For the purpose of this analysis, though distinction disappears over against the growing polarization between immigrants and natives. In this sense, the text is seen to be “about” the temple construction and the values by which the leaders govern others, especially the natives who form their chief social opposition.²¹⁵

Unlike other formalistic exegetical strategies, Berquist attested to the hybridized social scientific approaches with literary methods, particularly those of Derrida, Fish and Bakhtin, who focused on the fluidity of meanings with recognizing limitations as a researcher as he did

²¹³ Berquist, “Reading Difference in Isaiah 56-66,” 32.

²¹⁴ Berquist gives more credits on the political and priestly activities of Judeans in Babylon and Persian royal services and temple system during the exilic times. Unfortunately, he does not give more clarification on this. Berquist, “Reading difference in Isaiah 56-66,” 34. From his lecture on this topic in Spring 2018, the voice of the former would be considered Deuteronomistic, while the latter one is the priestly. This hypothesis is actually based on his previous sociological research on the Mal. 3:13-4:3 in 1989. Revising C. C. Torrey (pious orthodox, free thinkers, and ungodly of Israel) and S. Talmon (inner-group, in-group, and out-group), he suggests their groups are found in the text: 1) those who fear YHWH in 3:16 (true believers); 2) middle group 3:17-4:2 (skeptics and certain priests); and 3) those who non-belief is thoroughly rejected in 4:3 (the arrogant evildoers). Berquist, “The Social Setting of Malachi” in *BTB* 19 (1989), 125. As Julia M. O'Brien does (though she dates it for 605-586, Berquist put it in during the reign of Xerxes I) he views that Malachi's voice is deuteronomistic against priestly tradition. Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow*, 98-99. Julia M. O'Brien, *Priest and Levite in Malachi*. SBLDiss 121. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990). Hanson also views the messages of Malachi as a continuing voice of disenfranchised Levites after 515. Hanson, *The People Called*, 290. However, the omission of the Priestly Code influence is still debatable. Gordon Paul Hugenberger, *Marriage as a Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage Developed from the Perspective of Malachi* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 18-20; James D. Nogalski, *Introduction to the Hebrew Prophets* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2018) (Note, 5.45).

²¹⁵ Berquist, “Reading Difference in Isaiah 56-66,” 35.

himself.²¹⁶ Here his interpretive strategy is to reject the reductionistic reading that hopes to find patterns within the self-contained text itself. So, he views the text as a social interplay (polyphonic dynamics) between diverse interpretive communities.²¹⁷ However, it does not mean he totally gives up form-critical premises since he somehow also discusses their genre, forms, structure, and setting. For example, when he sets its genre as the “record of social conflict” or “report of progress,” it implies that the texts in chs. 56-66 are collected and arranged in the certain socio-political purpose for serving the Persian government.²¹⁸ Although he loosely introduces how to reconstruct each groups’ socio-economic interest by interpreting vocabulary usages in relation to material cultures in his article in *MTSR*, he more structurally analyzes the text with a cultural materialistic sense in his book.²¹⁹

²¹⁶ “This approach, however, limits itself by its vast recognition of difference. Since it sees difference everywhere, it can even out the difference that exists by refusing to see the difference between different differences.” Berquist, “Reading Difference in Isaiah 56-66,” 25.

²¹⁷ Berquist, “Reading Difference in Isaiah 56-66,” 39.

²¹⁸ Berquist, “Reading Difference in Isaiah 56-66,” 37, 39.

²¹⁹ Berquist, *Judaism in Persia’s Shadow*, 73-81.

Cycle 1 (56:1-57:21)

56:1-8 priestly immigrants: exclusive inclusion for imperial agents and collaborators

56:9-57:2 natives: criticism against priests

57:3-13 priestly immigrants: criticism against natives

57:14-22 intermediation

Cycle 2 (58:1-59:21)

58:1-15 priestly immigrants: directly argumentation to political immigrants

59:1-15a natives’ response

59:15b-20 political immigrants

59:21 intermediation

Cycle 3 (60:1-65:8)

60:1-3, 13-15 priestly immigrants

60:4-12, 60:16-63:19 political immigrants

64:1-12 natives

65:1-7 priest

65:8 intermediation

Cycle 4 (65:9-66:24)

4.7. Closing Remarks

Yehud is a small subprovince of Eber-Nari satrap under the Achaemenid dynasty. Even though the exilic literature envisions the land as the empty space nobody lives in, various groups of people lived there during the period of the Babylonian captivity. As Lipshits points out, there was no radical increase of population in Yehud after the returnees came into the land. Nevertheless, with the administrative and financial support of the Empire, the returning group took political and priestly leadership over the land. From the perspective of a newly emerging empire, it was indispensable to get local support from their conquered territories. So, it was beneficial to make those who were deported by Babylon go back to their own land. Most returnees were the second or third generation of the royal, aristocratic, priestly and scribal families before the fall of Jerusalem. Because they inherited monarchic heritage and legitimacy, they were able to claim their right to the land. Since returnees were well-educated on how to read and write, the process of documentation of oral collective memories was led by them. For example, the written Torah was the basis for their rule over Yehud and Jerusalem. Meanwhile, the non-returnees were being marginalized and alienated because those were not considered “orthodox” who retained a monarchic heritage during Babylonian captivity. So, not only the foreigners and the mixed people were excluded from the mainline community, but also those who remained on the land after 587/6.

65:9-25 political immigrants

66:1-6 natives

66:7-14 political immigrants

66:18-24 binding together two immigrants views condemning natives

With the sentiment of liberation, it is possible to envisage some level of messianic hope of being able to revive the former monarchy in their homeland. However, the postexilic historiography does not tell much about such attempts to restore the Davidic dynasty by Zerubbabel ben Shealtiel in Yehud even though prophetic texts expect that indirectly. Furthermore, we should be cautious of negative evaluations of the Persian rulers by Greek historians, particularly concerning Persia's conquest of Egypt, because the Pharaohship of the Persian Empire (as the twenty-seventh dynasty) continued from Cambyses II to Darius II until the late fifth century. Several rebellions occurred in the early reign of Darius I, but the rebellion from Yehud is not mentioned in Persian and Greek historiography. As Briant noted, there was not enough time and nor enough resources to take risks against the Empire. Also, there is no evidence that a Persian king entered into Jerusalem and committed blasphemous behavior against the Temple as in the case of Ptolemy I Soter in 302 and Antiochus IV Ephiphanes in 167 B.C.E.

The postexilic literature is more interested in priesthood than monarchy. Even though this small subprovince of Eber-Nari did not receive a great deal of attention from the Persian Empire, it does not explain that Yehud has a fully self-governing theocratic system under the connivance of the Empire. As in the case of Udjahorresnet of Egypt, political and priestly leaders of Yehud served for the interests of the Empire. The internal autonomy is guaranteed when the subjects retain and demonstrate their loyalty to the Empire. The imperial favor and support for building the Temple should be understood in this vein. From the perspective of the center, the local shrines and temples were considered as not only the place for preserving and performing local cultures and traditions, but also the source of revenue from taxes and tributes to pay for imperial

interests. That is why anti-Persian sentiment is hardly found in the postexilic literature, particularly under the reigns of the first five kings of the Persian Empire.

Trito-Isaiah also keeps silent about the Emperor, since he is one of the returnees who inherits the collective memories, manners, and attitudes toward the land and the Empire. Rather than to target imperial and colonial power, Trito-Isaiah is more interested in the internal issues in Persian Yehud between the postexilic reality and the Yahwistic ideal. The internal conflict between the reality and the ideal makes Trito-Isaiah deliver self-contradictory messages to his audiences and readers. His attitude toward in-groups and out-groups keeps the environment ambivalent between the core (Chs. 61-62) and the bookend (56:1-8; 66:1-24) within the final form of Trito-Isaiah.

Chapter Five

Prophetic Self-Awareness in Monologic Core (61:1-62:12)

The message of Trito-Isaiah is based on the collective memory of those those with monarchic heritage during the Babylonian captivity. The Isaianic tradition, including the messages of Isaiah ben Amoz, following redaction during the Josianic period and Deutero-Isaiah, is included in this collective memory within the mindset of postexilic returnees. The Isaianic collective memories are transmitted and reread by the anonymous speaker, who is called Trito-Isaiah. Chs. 61-62 offer a good example of how Trito-Isaiah subscribes to the traditional views on the land and the people. Here we will delve into how the anonymous speaker in Chs. 61-62 introduces himself as the future leader for the returning community in a monologic tone (this is thematically contradictory to what is delivered in 56:1-8 and 66:1-24). Structurally, these two chapters will be divided into seven subsections: 1) Inauguration and Commission (61:1-6); 2) Announcement of Salvation for People (61:7-9); 3) Praise of Rejoicing (61:10-11); 4) Pledge for Jerusalem (62:1); 5) Glorification of *Bat Zion* (62:2-5); 6) Appointment of Watchmen in Jerusalem (62:6-7); and 7) Announcement Divine Oath (62:8-9).

5.1. Exegesis

5.1.1. 61:1-6 Inauguration and Commission

61:1a Inaugural formula in first person (*ruah adonai yhwh 'alay*)

61:1b Prophetic commission as the anointed one for liberating the poor (‘*anawim*), the brokenhearted (*lenishberey-leb*), captives (*lishbuyim*) and prisoners (‘*asurim*).

61:2 Continuing commission to proclaim the year of favor (*shanat-ratzon*) and the day of vengeance (*yom naqam*)

62:3 Continuing commission on the male mourners in Zion: wearing a turban (*pe'ar*), pouring the oil of joy (*shemen sasown*), dressing in garments of praise (*ma'ateh tehilah*), and then calling them “oaks of righteousness (*'eyley hatzedek*)”

<Expected outcome>

61:4 Land: Reconstruction of devastated ruins (*horeb shomemot*)

61:5 Strangers (*zarim*) and Foreigners (*bene nekar*): Being shepherds and plowmen

61:6a Returned Jews: Being priesthood of YHWH (*kohaney yhwh*), ministers of our God (*mesharetey 'eloheynu*)

61:6b Returned Jews: They will be fed by the riches of nations (*goyim*)

61:1-6 is the first part of Chs. 61-62. This part is narrated by the first-person speaker who can not identify who he is. This anonymous speaker states his inauguration and commission in v. 1-3. The following verses (v. 4-6) show the expected results, caused by the inauguration, on the land, the existing inhabitants, and those who returned from Babylon recently. The message implies targeting particularly those who are responsible for ruling Jerusalem under the Persian Empire. However, this text seems monologic since it is only the anonymous first-person speaker who delivers his own claim mostly in poetic form without using a prophetic speech formula.

61:1a The expression “the Spirit of YHWH is on me (*ruah adonai yhwh 'alay*)” is different from the typical prophetic call narrative. Amos was called a prophet while he lived as a shepherd from Tekoa (Amos 7). Hosea’s calling is performed by marrying an adulterous woman (Hos 1). Throughout the temple vision, even though he was not a priest, Isaiah experienced the presence of YHWH and received the commission to make people blind and deaf (Isa 6). This happened after the death of Judean King Uzziah/Azariah who transgressed by burning incense in the holy place (2Chr 26). Jeremiah was called even before he was born from his mother’s womb (Jer 1). Because of his inescapable destiny to preach divine judgment against his land and

people, he reveals his Mosaic skepticism and melancholia on his existence and commission. Ezekiel, who belonged to the Zadokite priesthood and King Jehoiachin's entourage, affirmed his priestly-prophetic commission via the temple vision in Tel-Abib near River Chebar (one of the branches or canals of the Euphrates River) (Ezek 1). The entire process of prophetic calling involves a divine calling through divine speech, vision, and performance. Although he notices these characteristics of the call narrative, Childs regards 61:1-3 as a call by a "servant prophet" who continues the Deutero-Isaianic traditions and values.¹ However, the expression "the Spirit of YHWH is on me" implies the inaugurations of leaders during the period of judges and early royal figures rather than the typical prophetic calling: Othniel (Judg 3:10), Gideon (Judg 6:34), Jephthah (Judg 11:29), Samson (Judg 13:25; 14:6; 15:14). After Saul ben Kish was anointed as the first king of all Israel, he experienced prophetic ecstasy in receiving the Spirit of YHWH (1Sam 10:6, 10). When he was losing his royal legitimacy by YHWH, it states as "the Spirit of YHWH departed from him (1Sam 16:14)." Isa 11:2 links the Spirit of YHWH with one who belongs to the Davidic lineage (perhaps, Hezekiah or Josiah) as one who rules over Judah by the divine covenant and law. Although it is possible to connect the prophetic role with the roles of judges and early royals, receiving the Spirit of YHWH is more closely related to the political leadership that rules over and leads the community than prophetic roles to criticize the leadership. John Sietze Bergsma points out that the speaker here describes himself as a royal figure, but the following verses focus instead on priestly characteristics rather than royal ones.²

¹ Childs, *Isaiah: A Commentary*. OTL, 503.

² John Sietze Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation*. VTSup 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 200.

For these reasons, the first-person speaker in v.1a describes himself as an important political-priestly leader who has a responsibility to the community.

61:1b The speaker describes the divine anointment and following commissions in v. 1b. The anointment is performed to provide divine legitimacy to kings (1Sam 10:1; 16:12-13; 1Kgs 1:34, 39, 5:1; 19:16), priests (Exo 28:41; 29:7; 30:30; 40:13-15; Lev 8:12, 30; Num 35:25), prophets (1Kgs 19:16), and temple vessels (Exo 30:22-33). Even foreign leaders, such as Hazael of Aram-Damascus (1Kgs 19:15) and Cyrus II of Persia (Isa 45:1) also were described as recipients of the performance of pouring anointing oil. Interestingly, Deutero-Isaiah provides extraordinary political titles like the anointed and the shepherd. However, in the case of the suffering servant (Isa 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12), it is hard to find these kinds of expressions. As we discussed in Chapter Two, most scholars view the speaker of chs. 61-62 as being linked with the suffering servant in Deutero-Isaiah. However, the speaker of chs. 61-62 does not identify himself as a servant (*ebed*) in a singular sense. Also, servants (*abadim*) in a plural sense is found in 63:17; 65:13-15 and 66:14. Therefore, the speaker here is more close to the essential leader who claims his legitimacy by anointing rather than the suffering servant who is not recognized by people. It is very similar to what the anointed have to do in Isa 44:28 and 45:1 when the speaker claims to be the one who is responsible for liberating people and rebuilding the city. The interest in the poor is mentioned within the detailed commission of the anointed leader in Isa 11:1-9. Ps 72:4 also proposes the royal mission is to defend the cause of the poor, to bring deliverance to the children of the needy, and to crush the oppressor. When Job

retrospectively describes his social status in the past, he implies that he is the community leader who did righteous work for the poor, the orphan, and the widow (Job 29:11-17).

The three important missions are given to the speaker: 1) to bring good news to the poor; 2) to bind up the brokenhearted; 3) to proclaim liberty to the captives and to open the prison of those who are bound. The speaker's role here is combined with the role of herald, healer, and liberator. The image of the herald who delivers good news is found in Isa 52:7. The role of the healer is found in the story of Hezekiah's illness in Isa 38:21-22. Here the term *qara'* links with the prophetic role who delivers divine messages to public audiences (Jer 7:2; 11:6). When fasting is proclaimed as the sign of communal penitence, this term is used (Jer 36:9; Ezra 8:21; Jonah 3:5; c.f. 1Kgs 21:9, 12). This term is also linked with when proclaiming liberation (Jer 34:8, 15, 17; even though Zedekiah reverses his decision of liberating Israelite servants). Like the case of Jer 34, the term *deror* is parallel with the term *qara'*.

61:2 The speaker's leadership role is continuously described. The concept of "year of grace (*shenat-ratzon*)," which is parallel with "the day of vengeance (*yom naqam*)" is an abstract notion since it does not specify when it will happen. Isa 49:8 also uses "time of favor (*'et ratzon*)" with "day of salvation (*yom yeshua'h*)" to deliver a hopeful message of restoration to exiles. So, these are implications of the Day of YHWH (*yom yhwh*) which contains positive and negative connotations both. Since the Day of YHWH (*yom yhwh*) is usually used for describing divine judgment against Israel and foreign nations (Amos 5:18-20). In the Book of Isaiah, this term is usually used for describing the restoration of Judah (Isa 2:2-4; 11:10) and judgment

against foreign nations (Isa 13:6; 34:8; 63:4). In this respect, “the day of vengeance (*yom naqam*)” against foreign nations will be a comfort (*naham*) for the returning community.

61:3 It is the message for the returnees who were lamenting and despairing of the devastated Jerusalem. Even though the existing inhabitants still lived in that town, the returnees were not satisfied with the situation of Jerusalem since the reality did not match with their ideal expectation. The images of ashes, mourning, and a faint spirit are related to a communal situation of fasting and wailing for repentance (Neh 9:1; Jonah 3:5; Dan 9:3). Zechariah, who is a contemporary of Trito-Isaiah, introduces crucial fasting season in the fourth, fifth (Tisha B’Av), seventh, and tenth months of the Jewish Calendar (Zech 7:3-5), then promises will be joyful, glad and cheerful feasts (*mo’edim*) with the Yahwistic restoration of community (Zech 8:19). The speaker here also describes the restoration of the fastings to show that returning people will perform ablutions and wear new garments. This scene reminds us of Joshua ben Jehozadak (1Chr 6:15; MT 1Chr 5:41) who changes his filthy garments to new ones in Zechariah’s fourth vision (Zech 3:3-5).³ In the case of Joshua the high priest, the term *tsanip* is used for describing his clean turban. Here the term *pe’ar* is used for a turban that is bestowed on the male mourners in Zion (c.f. Exo 39:28; Ezek 44:18; this term is also used for women. See,

³ Oniads Family attribute their origin to Joshua the High Priest. According to Flavius Joshepus, Onias I is introduced as the son of Jaddua and the grandson of Johanan/John (*Ant.* XI. 8.7). Jaddua is described as the contemporary of Alexander the Great, one who lived during the mid- and late-fourth century B.C.E. (*Ant.* XI. 7.2; 8. 2, 4, 7). If we follow this theory, it would be related to Jaddua the son of Johanan in Neh 12:22 (or Jonathan in Neh 12:11). For reference, Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) 50:1-24 mentions Simon son of Onias the Priest. Even though traditionally it is considered to be Simon the Just (Simon I ben Onias I), it is possible to refer to Simon II ben Onias II under the rule of the Selucid empire in the third century B.C.E. (c.f. 3 Macc 2:1). Maccabean/Hasmonean family during the second and first century B.C.E. also attributed their origin to Jehoiairib/Joarib (1Macc 2:1; 1Chr 24:7), one of the descendants of Zadok, who was placed in the first rank of priesthood. Concerning more discussions, James W. Watts, “Scripturalization and the Aaronide Dynasties” *JHS* 13.6 (2013), 1-15.

Isa 3:20; Ezek 24:17, 23). These people soon will be identified as the priests of YHWH in v.6. The term *'ayil* of *'eyley hatzedek* is considered as the modification of *'elah*, which means terebinth and oak.⁴ However, the term *'ayil* also has other meanings like ram, pilaster, and leader. For example, in Ezekiel's vision of a new temple, this term is used for door jambs (Ezek 40:9, 21, 24, 26, 29, 31, 37). Therefore it is possible to say that the term *'ayil* has dual meanings to imply leadership roles of returning people in the situation of temple reconstruction, which is implied in the following verses.

61:4 The perspective of the first-person speaker continues in vv.4-6 by using *waw* conjunction in the beginning of v. 4. This verse enumerates the specific missions of all returning people who are priestly appointed. First of all, it implies that their mission is about rebuilding the land that has been devastated for a long time. The speaker here uses the language of construction jobs as 58:12 does, but the main purpose is to say what will happen in the land of Yehud, particularly Jerusalem. However it is hard to say that the speaker intends to make the returning people participate in construction works directly, since 60:10-13 claims that the construction jobs are given to foreigners. This escatological picture of universal pilgrimage is very different from what historiography reports since the priestly roles are limited to a certain group of people and the building construction is led and performed by the returning people while they received financial and administrative support from the Achaemenid dynasty. According to historiography, the returning people began to construct the foundation of the second Temple while Levites over the age of twenty years served as construction supervisors (Ezra 3:8). When the foundation was

⁴ Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. vol. 1. trans. M. E. J. Richardson (Leiden: Brill, 2001). 40.

done, the priests and the Asaphite singers led the worship of praise (Ezra 3:10-11). When Ezra was in River Ahava (a canal of Euphrates River) on the road to the homeland, he summoned the Levites and Nethinim serve for the Second Temple (Ezra 4:15-20; 7:7). During the first term of Nehemiah, the wall of Jerusalem was rebuilt by returned people under the supervision of Eliashib ben Joiakim ben Joshua (Neh 3:1; c.f. 12:10).⁵ Since the text here presumes all returning people have priestly responsibilities without any mention of a certain priestly group, it is hard to say that it implies Zadokites polemics against Levites (Ezek. 44:10-15) or their reversal (Mal 2:1-9).

Nethinim are counted with Servants of Solomon in postexilic historiography (Ezra 2:43-8; Neh 7:48-60; 1Chr 9:2). These two groups are rooted in the non-Israelite ancestors who served for Levites in the Temple (Ezra 8:20). They were living in Ophel, where the defensive watchtower was located in the ridge of Jerusalem (Neh 3:26, 31; 11:21). Gibeonites are also mentioned (Neh 7:25; c.f. Ezra 2:20, 25). They were serving the House of God (*beit 'elohay*) since they made a conditional covenant (suzerain-vassal treaty) with Joshua (Josh 5:3 9:23, 27).⁶ Nethinim, Servants of Solomon, and Gibeonites were already assimilated into the Jewish community when the exiled were returning into Yehud although they were considered as the non-Israelite descendants.⁷ These assimilated groups who have foreign lineages fit with the in-

⁵ The great-grandson of Eliashib the High Priest married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite, who was the leader of Samaria during the second term of Nehemiah (Neh 13:28).

⁶ The Gibeonites cities were places where the Ark of the Covenant resided in the Ark Narrative (1Sam 4-6; 2Sam 6). Interestingly, Chronicler refers to Gibeon as the ancestor of Saul (2Chr 8:29-40), but Deuteronomist describes the relationship between Saul and Gibeonites as mutual enemies (2Sam 21:1-9). Donna Laird, *Negotiating Power in Ezra-Nehemiah* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 96.

⁷ Haran presumes that Gibeonites were integrated into Nethinim, but too hypothetical. Menahem Haran, "The Gibeonite, the Nethinim and the Sons of Solomon's Servants" in *VT* 11.1 (1961), 166.

group to whom the speaker intends to deliver his message of restoration. So, it is hard to say that their duties as temple servants become problematic during the postexilic period since they already belong to and have even been assimilated into Israelite community.⁸

Some foreigners have opportunities to join the assembly of YHWH with some restrictions (Deut 23:1-8). If they decide to follow YHWH, they have to submit to circumcision to participate in Jewish ceremonies like Passover (Exo 12:48). Even though biblical texts do not tell us much about these assimilated foreign descent groups, it is unnecessary to identify the uncircumcised foreigners of Ezek 44:7-9.⁹ It is necessary to distinguish those groups that have been assimilated for a long time with the actual non-Israelite inhabitants in the reality of Persian Yehud, which are called *bene nekar* (Isa 56:3, 6; 60:10; 61:5; 62:8; Ezek 44:7-9).

61:5 Now the speaker explains the role of those who do not belong to the in-group. They are called strangers (*zarim*) and foreigners (*nekar*). The narrative sets their roles as shepherds, plowmen, and vinedressers who are providing labor and food and paying taxes or tributes to the ruling class. In fact, these occupations are very important to support and sustain the agricultural society of ancient Israel (Isa 28:24-28; Joel 1:11; Hab 3:16). Isaiah the late eighth-century prophet analogized the socially unjust in his contemporary Southern Judah and Jerusalem with the vineyard metaphor to deliver a divine message of judgement (Isa 5:1-7). Isa 27:3-4 shows

⁸ Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Exclusion of Netinim and Proselytes in 4Q Florilegium" in *Revue de Qumrân* 8.1 (1972), 89-91 = *Studies in Qumran Law* (Leiden: Brill, 1977): 77-79; J. Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 167.

⁹ Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies (New York: Meridian Books, 1957; Originally published in 1878), 218 (footnote, 1); Nathan MacDonald, *Priestly Rule: Polemic and Biblical Interpretation in Ezekiel 44*, BZAW 476 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 26-33; Margaret Barker, "Isaiah" in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*. ed. James D. G. Dunn (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 541.

that YHWH delivers his message of restoration from the vinedresser's point of view. Like Job Jindo's conceptual observations, the vineyard metaphor would be linked with the relationship between mediating leadership and its followers in the Yahwistic community, which is symbolized as the divine garden.¹⁰ In the Book of Isaiah, the shepherd is variously analogized with YHWH (Isa 40:11), Cyrus II (Isa 44:28), and the leaders of Yehud (Isa 56:11). However, the text here is more-focused on the vocational functions of agricultural society rather than the metaphorical implication of leadership. The eschatological vision of all nations becoming workers who are to serve the people of Israel is already mentioned in messages of the late eighth-century prophets like Micah and Isaiah (Mic 4:1-5; Isa 2:2-4, contra. Joel 3:9-10). It is one of the chief topics by YHWH's prophets to attempt to imagine subordinating all nations under the fully restored leadership of the Davidic dynasty (which is based on collective nostalgia of ancient national heroes like David and Solomon).

Therefore, the speaker follows the previous eschatological vision of restoration but reconstructs it from the perspectives of returned people. According to the reports after the fall of Jerusalem, Nebusaradan put the poor vinedressers and plowmen to work while he took the ruling class off to Babylon (2Kgs 25:12; Jer 52:16). He distributed lands to the poor who did not have anything (Jer 39:10), then collected taxes from them (Jer 40:10, 12). Even though there were other refugees who went down to Egypt after the death of Gedaliah (Jer 42-44), most of the poor might have lived continuously in Judah under the rule of Babylon. They were the real inhabitants of the land even though the Babylonian exiles had imagined that the land was totally devastated

¹⁰ Jindo, *Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered*, 161-2.

after the destruction. From the perspective of the returnees, all the inhabitants of Yehud were others who did not have any legitimacy to rule over Yehud and Jerusalem. If this scenario is applicable for our reading of chs. 61-62, the concept of strangers (*zarim*) and foreigners (*nekar*) does not only indicate non-Israelite foreign inhabitants but also includes lower-class inhabitants who were not affected by the series of deportations. For example, we can find similar usage in the Book of Job, which is regarded as the (post-)exilic text. In Job 19:15, Job confesses he has become a stranger (*zar*) and a foreigner (*bene nekar*) to his friends and neighbors. Ps 69:8 also describes the miserable situation of the poetic speaker by the parallel of these two terms. Therefore, subscribing to the perspective of returned exiles, the text here otherizes most of the existing inhabitants, whether Jew, Samarian, or foreigners, who have long lived in Yehud without any effects from the Babylonian deportation.

61:6 On the Day of YHWH as the year of grace and salvation, the returnees are appointed as the priesthood of YHWH (*kohaney yhwh*) and ministers of our God (*mesharetey 'eloheynu*). This scene is connected with wearing new garments in v.3. The returning community consisted of the descendants (second or third generations) of Judean royals, aristocrats, priests, Levites, and scribes who experienced the Babylonian exile. Furthermore, the descendants of non-Israelites who served the monarch and temple were also included. If we consider the characteristics of chs. 60-62 as succeeding to the traditional nationalistic views, here those who are appointed as priests and ministers would be the returned Jews who inherit the Davidic-Solomonic monarchic heritage. While the returning group takes charge of the administrative roles over Yehud by the Persian Empire, the existing inhabitants should serve for them as v.5

describes. The nationalistic ideals, rooted in their collective memory of the Davidic-Solomonic Empire, go further to expect the universal pilgrimage that Zion will receive bountiful tributes and taxes from all nations (*goyim*).

5.1.2. 61:7-9 Announcement of Salvation for People

61:7a Cause 1: Rationalization of the past suffering by counting it in double (*mishneh*)

61:7b Effect 1: Future transformation will be counted based above.

61:8a Cause 2: Formal statement on divine nature of YHWH who love justice ('oheb *mishpat*) and hate robbery with a burnt offering (*gazel be'olah*)

61:8b Effect 2: YHWH's announcement to make eternal covenant (*brit olam*) with people

<Expected outcome>

61:9a Descendants and their offsprings: they will be known among the nations (*goyim*)

61:9b The people who see them: they will acknowledge them "the seed blessed by YHWH (*zera berak yhwh*)"

Verses 7-9 is the scene of covenantal renewal between YHWH and the returning people. The speaker here temporarily shifts from the anonymous speaker to YHWH. Even though the lines between the speech of the anonymous prophet and YHWH's speech are very blurred, we can say it is YHWH's speech for three reasons: 1) there is no mark of *waw*-consecutive in the beginning of v.7; 2) the contents of blessing is coherently found in v.7 and v.9; 3) the YHWH introduces himself as the first person pronoun I ('*ani*) in v.8. After two causal explanations are delivered in vv.7-8, v.9 introduces what will happen in the near future. In terms of thematic value, this divine speech is coherent with what the anonymous speaker delivers. However, it also has a monologic tone since it is hard to find clues of interaction like using the divine speech form or the prophetic speech form to make the audience pay attention. Another similar case is found in the form of quotation in 62:8, 11.

61:7 v.7a describes the past painful experience (shame and dishonor) as having the double value of compensation for the returnees. This logic is found in the instruction of recompensing double the amount of the loss of theft everyday life in Torah (Exo 22:4, 7, 9). The concept of double value was already introduced when the judgment against Judah was proclaimed in the early sixth century: YHWH's judgment will be doubled the amount of the present sinful behaviors and hypocritical minds. (Jer. 16:16-18; In Jer 17:18, Jeremiah also mentions "double judgment" against those who persecute him). In this vein, Deutero-Isaiah proclaimed that Jerusalem already received "double for all her sins" (Isa 40:2). This provides a basis for a reversal from double judgment to double blessing in 7b (c.f. Zech 9:12). In the epilogues of the Book of Job, YHWH recompensed double the size of his loss properties (Job 42:10).

61:8 v.8a is the typical statement of YHWH's nature, so it provides a basis for the eternal covenant (*berit olam*) with the returning people in v.8b. Here YHWH introduces himself as '*ani*' in the first person pronoun. In Ps. 37:28, the phrase "love justice ('*oheb mishpat*)" is also introduced with *ki* conjunction. So, it functions as a basis of "turn away from evil and do good" in Ps 37:27. The term robbery (*gazel*) is also identified as taking *mishpat* off from the poor (*aneye 'ammi*) in Isa 10:2, when the prophet accused unlawful Northern Israel of plundering the lower class people: the poor, widow, and orphan during the Syro-Ephraimite War in the late eighth century (c.f. Deut 18:18; 24:19). When the poor ('*anawim*') is first introduced in the monologue of the first-person anonymous speaker in Isa 61:1a, this term implies not the socio-economic class, but the returnees who came back from Babylon. The term *be'olah* in v.8a means

the burnt offering at the surface level, but this term also has another meaning of injustice and wrong (*'awelah*).¹¹ If we consider the unsettled liturgical situation before the completion of building the Second Temple, it is possible to accept this dual meaning to describe unjust religious performances.

The concept of eternal covenant (*berit olam*) implies the covenantal relationship between YHWH and the people of Israel with a certain symbolic sign (*'ot*): a rainbow that is a promise to sustain all creatures (Gen 9:16), circumcision bonding Abraham and his family with YHWH (Gen 17:13, 19), the promise with Isaac and Jacob (1Chr 16:15-17; Ps 105:5-10; c.f. Gen 28:10-22; 32:13-32; 35:1-15), Sabbath forming a people of Israel who live according to the divine order (Exo 31:16); the revenue of the priesthood (Lev 24:8-9; Num 18:19), eternal priesthood throughout the line of Phinehas (Num 25:12), the national covenant in Gilgal (Josh 4:7; Judg 2:1), and monarchic covenant for Davidic dynasty (2Sam 7:16; 24:5; 2Kgs 9:4-5; 2Chr 13:5; 21:7; Ps 89:3-4, 28-29). However, when we turn our attention to Isa. 24-27, chapters which are presupposed by Christopher B. Hays, as being written during the Josianic time, the eternal covenant was broken by the disobedient people and the land became filthy (Isa 24:5).¹² This tendency is reversed through the ministry of YHWH the redeemer (*goel*) in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 41:14; 44:24; 48:17; 49:26; 54:4, 8), so we see that the Davidic covenant is democratized from the monarch only and now refers to all exiled-returned people. The text here follows this line of thought that the returnees have legitimacy and heritage of the divine eternal covenant. However,

¹¹ Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic (BDB)* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997; based on the lexicon of William Gesenius, originally published in Boston, 1906), 730.

¹² Christopher B. Hays, "Make Peace with Me: The Josianic Origins of Isaiah 24–27" *Int* 73.2 (2019), 143-57.

unlike the text here, in Isa 59:20-21, the recipients of the eternal covenant are specified as “those in Jacob who turn from transgression.” It reveals Trito-Isaiah’s biconceptuals on the in-group and out-group.

61:9 This shows an expectation of the outcome of YHWH’s renewed covenant with the returnees. It is connected to the nationalistic vision in v. 5-6. The community formed by the second and third generation of those who were exiled would be known as “the seed blessed by YHWH (*zera berak yhw*)” among the people of all nations (*goyim*). The expression appears again in the context of the new creation in Isa 65:23, but it is specified in relation to the pious group fearing the word of YHWH.

5.1.3. 61:10-11 Praise of Rejoicing

61:10aa Formal statement of rejoicing: I will surely rejoice in YHWH

61:10ab-10ac Target (simile) 2: YHWH clothes me the garment of salvation (*bigedey-yesha’*) and the robe of righteousness (*me’iy*l *tzedaqah*)

61:10b Source (simile) 1: like (kaph prep.) tuban (*pe’ar*) of bridegroom and jewels (*keleyha*) of brides in a wedding scene.

61:11a Source (simile) 2: like (kaph prep.) earth and garden works for budding and blooming.

61:11b Target (simile) 2: YHWH makes righteousness (*tzedaqah*) and praise (*tehilah*) blooming before all nations (*kol-hagoyim*)

The speaker shifts now to a first person anonymous speaker because YHWH is now indicated as the third masculine singular in v.10aa. This text is regarded as the response to YHWH’s earlier speech. However, this speaker did not focus on the returnees, who renewed the eternal covenant with YHWH, but on himself. Therefore, it should be said that the monologic tone continues on without any attention to the audience.

61:10 Verse 10 begins with the formal statement of rejoicing that is found in 1Sam 2:1 and other Psalmic texts although they use different terms to express the feeling of rejoicing.¹³ The special relationship between the speaker and YHWH is described by two similes. The first comparison is the scene where someone prepares ceremonial dresses and gifts for a bride and a bridegroom. Isa 49:18 analogizes the returnee going back to Jerusalem as the bride decorating herself. A tuban (*pe'ar*) has already appeared when the speaker highlights the priesthood of all returnees in v.3, but it is given to the anonymous speaker himself now who is described like a bride and a bridegroom. Therefore, YHWH is not identified with the bridegroom (usually the people of Israel or the *Bat Zion* are identified with the bride), but described as the dresser or stylist who prepares and adjusts wedding clothing and ornaments. It reminds us of the divine order to take off the filthy garments of Joshua the high priest and wear new clean ones (Zech 3:1-5). It implies that the first person speaker who proclaims himself as the anointed in v.1 describes his leadership in terms of priestly authority.¹⁴ Therefore it reveals his self-awareness as the political-priestly leader who can lead the returnees' community in Yehud. His ideal was very different from what happened in the late sixth century Yehud led by Zerubbabel the governor and Joshua the high priest.

61:11 The second analogy is related to the ministry of land and the garden's ability to sprout buds and bloom flowers. This productive image is related to the ideal collective memory of the divine garden (*gan yhwh*) which is mentioned in Isa 51:3. Contrarily, chs. 65-66 shows

¹³ The term *sus* used here is the intensifying infinite. It is the only case to use *sus* by combining an infinite absolute and a finite verb. Ronald J. Williams, *Williams' Hebrew Syntax, third edition*. revised and expanded by John C. Beckman (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 85.

¹⁴ Sweeney, *Isaiah 40-66*, 312-30.

gardens where idols are worshipped (Isa 65:3; 66:17; c.f. a garden without water in Isa 1:30). While the concept of the divine garden usually describes YHWH as the king or the gardener because he is responsible for the creation, here it is the land and garden that are identified with YHWH.¹⁵

5.1.4. 62:1 Pledge for Jerusalem

62:1 Pledge (twofold parallel statements): he will not rest of Jerusalem

The anonymous first-person speaker continues to speak with a monologic tone. Now this man, who proclaims himself as a political-priestly leader, pledges his mission to serve Jerusalem. A form of pledge here is composed of a typical type of twofold synonymous parallel statements. The speaker assures that he will not take a rest from Zion's salvation and righteousness. In this respect, the speaker's political-priestly ministry of appointment continues for all returnees (61:1-6), the speaker himself (61:10-11), then Jerusalem in the following verses.

5.1.5. 62:2-5 Glorification of *Bat Zion*

62:2a Nations (*goyim*) and kings (*melakim*): they will see your righteousness and glory.

62:2b *Bat Zion*: you will get a new name by the mouth of YHWH (*pi yhw*)

62:3 Glorification 1: you will be a beautiful crown (*'ateret tip'eret*) and a royal diadem (*tzanip melukah*) in the hand of God

62:4a Past status (contradiction): you were called as "Forsaken (*'azubah*)" and "Desolate (*shemamah*)"

62:4ba Glorification 2: you will be renamed "My Desire (*hephzi-bah*)" and "Married (*beulah*)"

62:4bb Additional explanation of symbolic names

62:5aa Source (simile) 1: like (kaph prep.) a young man marries a young woman

¹⁵ Jindo, *Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered*, 161-2.

62:5ab Target (simile) 1: your sons (*banayik*) will marry (rule over) you

62:5ba Source (simile) 2: as the bridegroom over the bride

62:5bb Target (simile) 2: your God will rejoice over you

62:2-3 The term all nations (*goyim*), which is mentioned in Isa. 61:6, 9, is parallel with kings (*melakim*) in v.2a. While the previous verses describe that all nations will recognize and serve the returnees, here they will see the righteousness and glory of Jerusalem itself. As Isa 60 does, Jerusalem here is referred to as the second feminine singular pronoun but this city keeps silent. The personification of the city is usually found in the ancient Near Eastern context and in prophetic literature. The relationship between the divine being and the city is analogous to the family relationship like bridegroom-bride or parent-child.¹⁶ The typical example is the dramatic contrast between *Bat Babylon* (Isa 47:1) and *Bat Zion* (Isa 52:2) to show how YHWH will deliver his people from the exploiting hand of the empire.

Bat Zion will get a new name delivered by the mouth of YHWH (*pi yhw*). This expression is found in Isa 1:20; 40:5; and 58:14. The Proto-Isaiah uses this term in the context of judgment, and the Deutero-Isaiah uses it for highlighting the restoration. Since the Deutero-Isaianic emphasis of restoration is followed by the text here, here the divine mouth is speaking of the positive messages rather than the negative ones. Here the mouth of YHWH (*pi yhw*) is parallel with the hand of YHWH (*yad yhw*) in Isa 62:3 (Meanwhile, Isa 58:14 uses the mouth of YHWH highlighting the pious attitude on fasting and Sabbath). The divine hands (especially, right hand, *yamin*) or arms (*zero'a yhw*) are deeply related to the theme of judgment and restoration after the exodus occurs (Exo 9:3,15; 15:6, 12, 16; 16:3; Num 11:23; Josh. 4:24;

¹⁶ For more discussion, read K. P. Darr. *Isaiah's Vision*.

22:31). In the case of the divine mouth, the divine hand is referred to as the hand against foreign nations like Egypt and Moab in the Proto-Isaiah (Isa 19:16; 25:10). Deutero-Isaiah's description is more complicated. The divine hand was the punishing hand against disobedient Jerusalem before the deportation (40:2; 59:1), but now it is described as the delivering hand for the exiles (c.f. Isa 41:20 mentions the creating hand to emphasize the monotheistic theology). Therefore the scene that changes the nicknames of *Bat Zion* from negative to positive is deeply related to the ministry of the divine mouth and hand. These anthropomorphic metaphors to divinity are utilized for showing divine ministry visually to the actual readers building his concepts in terms of embodied and cultural experiences.

62:4-5 Verse 4a introduces what were the previous nicknames of *Bat Zion* as Forsaken (*azubah*) and Desolate (*shemamah*). These two terms are very important *leitwort* in the whole context of the Book of Isaiah. For example, we can see these two terms in the first chapter of the Book; they are used to denounce the unfaithful and unjust situation in Judah and Jerusalem: the first one is referred to in Isa 1:4 and the second one is in Isa 1:7. Also, we can find both of them in Isa 6:11-12 (the closing remarks in the call of Isaiah) and 17:9 (criticism against the Syro-Ephraimite alliance). While Proto-Isaiah does not directly connect these terms with *Bat Zion*, Deutero-Isaiah links them with *Bat Zion* by using a family metaphor. The previous *Bat Zion*'s status is described as one who has been forsaken in YHWH's quotation of Zion's in Isa 49:14. Here the relationship between YHWH and *Bat Zion* analogizes with the parent-child model. However, in Isa 54:6-7, this relationship follows the husband-wife model. YHWH proclaims she is no longer to be a woman forsaken by her husband. In this respect, Deutero-Isaiah emphasizes

that YHWH the redeemer (*goel*) will not forsake his people of Israel ever again (Isa 41:17; 42:16). Even though the target is limited to the exiled people and their descendants, This promise is like the Noahic covenant since YHWH decides not to punish his people any longer (Isa 54:9).

In the continuing lines of thought with Deutero-Isaiah, Verse 4ba describes how nicknames of *Bat Zion* are changed into My Delight Is in Her (*heptzi-bah*) and Married (*b'ulah*). The verb *habetz* is used in the Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 42:21; 44:28; 46:10; 48:14; 53:10; 54:12). Even though there is no direct connection with this text, *Heptzi-bah* is also found in the name of Hezekiah's wife who was the mother of Manasseh (2Kgs 21:1). This coincidence may imply that Trito-Isaiah is based on the collective memory rooted in the Isaianic tradition.¹⁷ Further, the relationship between YHWH and *Bat Zion* is described not only as that of the parent-child but also as the husband-wife in the following verse 5b, unlike YHWH who takes the role of stylist or dresser for newlyweds in 61:10. In the first simile in v. 5aa-ab, the speaker continues describing YHWH as one who rejoices because of his daughter's wedding as he does in the previous verse. Interestingly, her bridegroom will be "your sons (*banayik*)" who symbolize the returnees. At this point, *Bat Zion* becomes not only the mother but also the young bride of the returnees. However, it is necessary to consider the dual meanings of *banayik*. As Paul V. Niskanen and HCP Kim argue, reading *banayik* as "your builders" would be one of the possibilities when we consider H. Rowley's correction of this term and the intertextual allusions between Isa 49:14-19 and Isa

¹⁷ The later Rabbinic Jewish and Christian tradition to regard Isaiah ben Amoz as the maternal grandfather might be based on the linkage of 2Kgs 21:1 and Isa 62:4. Francesca Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh and Child Sacrifice: Biblical Distortions of Historical Realities*, BZAW 338 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004), 123. (footnote 11)

62:1-2.¹⁸ If we consider the ambiguous writing style of Trito-Isaiah and its context of the delayed construction of the Second Temple, it is possible to accept both the meaning of builders and sons to identify the returnees.

The second simile in v. 5ba-bb now follows the examples of the husband-wife model of Isa 54:4-8, Hos 1-3, and Mal 2:15-16. However, these exemplary texts imply the long-married relationship that experiences the crisis of adultery and divorce, but the marriage relationship here is described as that of newlyweds (even though the past nickname of *Bat Zion* is mentioned in v.4a). Although the family metaphor in v.5 is a little bit awkward and complicated, this implies restoring the covenant relationship between YHWH and *Bat Zion* in either way.

5.1.6. 62:6-7 Appointment of Watchmen in Jerusalem

62:6aa Appointment: I appoint watchmen (*shomrim*) in the wall of Jerusalem

62:6ab Mission 1: they shall never be silent all day and night.

62:6b Mission 2: they shall take no rest.

62:7 Mission 3: they make YHWH no rest until he establishes Jerusalem

62:6-7 The anonymous first-person speaker continues to deliver his message to Jerusalem in v. 6-7. As she does in v. 2-5, *Bat Zion* does not answer to him. His monologic tone is continued without any reply and talk-back from his real audience. Now the speaker, who proclaims the radical changes of *Bat Zion*'s name and status in v.2-5, appoints the watchmen (*shomrim*) who will protect the restored Jerusalem at its walls in v. 6aa. Since the speaker proclaimed his leadership as a herald to deliver the good news (Isa 61:1; c.f. 52:7), he does not identify himself as a watchman.

¹⁸ Paul V. Niskanen, "Who Is Going to Marry You? The Text of Isaiah 62:5" *CBQ* 77.4. (2015) 657-67; Kim, *Reading Isaiah*, 282.

Concerning the role of watchmen, it is found in the oracle against the wilderness of the sea (Babylon) and Duma (Edom) in Isa 21:6-9, 11-12 (which was redacted during the fall of Jerusalem in the early sixth century).¹⁹ The watchmen, who stand at the walls and watchtowers, have responsibilities to keep their eyes on the arrival of heralds and to protect against the invasion of enemies. Their role is to guard the security of the castle by delivering what happens on the outside to the leaders of the castle (c.f. 2Kgs 9:8, 17). Habakkuk, who does his prophecy around 605 B.C.E., also describes himself as a watchman who waits for the hopeful message from YHWH when he is standing in the watchtower (Hab 2:1; c.f. Ezek 3:17; Ps 130:6). Deutero-Isaiah also mentions watchmen who sing the song of restoration when YHWH comes back into Zion throughout the highway (Isa. 52:8; c.f. Jer 31:6). Therefore, the scene appointing watchmen here is aligned with the hopeful expectation of restoration.

The missions of watchmen are summarized in v. 6ab-7 in three categories: 1) they shall never be silent all day and night; 2) they shall take no rest, and 3) they give YHWH no rest until he establishes Jerusalem. Therefore the watchmen here are close to the one who watches and protects the city all day and night, not like one who receives and delivers the news. The reason why the anonymous speaker himself performs not only as the passive herald but also in the active role of announcing the liberating message in 61:1.²⁰ Nevertheless, the watchmen's role

¹⁹ John Day, "Inner-Biblical Interpretation in the Prophets" in *"The Place Is Too Small for Us": The Israelite Prophets in Recent Scholarship*. Ed. Robert P. Gordon (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns: 1995), 243; Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 244; See also, A. A. Macintosh, *Isaiah 21: A Palimpsest* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1980).

²⁰ Following verses in 63:1-2, this speaker takes the role to monitor someone (YHWH) coming up from the South and then asking him to identify who he is. Even though this role is very similar to what watchmen do, the speaker does not provide more details of his dialogue with YHWH. The interaction after ch. 63 is more dialogic while the speaker keeps a monologic tone.

would not be dismissed since they have to remind YHWH to not take a rest until completing the reconstruction of the temple (c.f. Ps 127:1). The term watchmen does not only indicate the functional roles but contains the spiritual implication to highlight how administrative leaders rule over Jerusalem in the light of the divine covenant.

This image of watchmen protecting Jerusalem in 62:6-7 contrasts with the watchmen described in Isa 56:7. They are criticized as the blind and deaf who do not do their duty for the community. The blindness and deafness metaphor is to indicate disobedient people who do not follow the YHWH's words in the entire Book of Isaiah. These disloyal watchmen who do not listen to the words of YHWH are identified with the leaders of Israel and Judah in spite of impending national crisis by foreign enemies (Jer 6:17; Ezek 33:2, 6-7; c.f. Hos 9:8; Ps 127:1). Following this framework, Trito-Isaiah condemns the current leaders of the returning community in the late sixth century B.C.E.

5.1.7. 62:8-9 Announcement Divine Oath

62:8a Formal statement of a divine oath

62:8b Enemies (‘*oyeb*) and foreigners (*bene nekar*): he will not give your grain and new wine to them.

62:9 Returned Jews (harvester, gatherer): only they shall eat, praise YHWH, and drink it in divine courts (*behatzerot qadshiy*).

62:8a The speaker quotes YHWH's oath and following announcement to the ingroup and outgroup. YHWH pledges himself by his mighty right hand (*yamin*) and arm (*zero'a 'uzzo*).²¹ As we discussed above, these anthropomorphic images are linked to explain divine judgment and

²¹ In Ps 118:15, the right arm is modified by *chayil*, which means might and vanality.

restoration visually to the actual readers. Lifting a hand is related to the pledge in the covenantal ceremony between the two sides. When Abraham made a covenant with the king of Sodom through the intermediary role of Melchi-Zedek the king of Salem, he was lifting his hand to YHWH (Gen 14:22). YHWH also analogizes himself as the one lifting a hand as a sign of pledge to explain when he retrospects how he delivered the people of Israel from the land of Egypt as an accomplishment of his previous promise made to ancient Patriarchs (Ezek 20:5-6). In other words, the performance of pledging by one's hand and arm is related to the covenantal ceremony. Therefore, the verse. 8a here reveals YHWH's action as a response to his mention of renewal of the eternal covenant (*berit olam*) with the returning community in Isa 61:8.

62:8b-9 Following the announcement of the pledge, this part provides the details about what YHWH will do with the ingroup (the community of returnees) and the outgroup (the community of non-returnees). While v. 8b is about the outgroup which is described as enemies ('*oyeb*) and foreigners (*bene nekar*), v. 9 focuses on the ingroup which is described as farmers harvesting crops or gathering grapes. The term foreigners (*bene nekar*) here is parallel with the enemies ('*oyeb*) in the quotation of YHWH's words. This implies that the anonymous speaker who quotes YHWH's words has some level of hostility against the people who do not belong to the returning community. This antagonism is far more exclusive than previous descriptions of the outgroup in ch. 61. For example, 61:5 suggests that the strangers (*zarim*) and foreigners (*nekar*) will serve the returning community as the farmer and vinedresser. All nations (*goyim*) will pay tributes for Israel while they recognize the returnees live under blessing and protection by YHWH (61:6, 9). Unlike describing non-returnees as those who serve in agriculture and

horticulture for the political-priestly ruling class in Persian Yehud, this vision of outsourcing is renounced by the nationalistic view of economic self-reliance in terms of production and consumption. Grain (*dagan*) and fresh wine (*tirosh*) are the results of people of ingroup having labored, so they should not be available to the external enemies. Only those who are harvesting and gathering can eat grains and drink fresh wines in the courts of my sanctuary (*bechatzrot qadoshi*) while praising YHWH. Even though this statement here is quoted from what YHWH speaks, this implies that the anonymous speaker imagines the fully recovered and completed space of Jerusalem to be a totally exclusive community that includes only the returnees themselves.

Further, the expression “in the courts of my holy (place)” (*bechatzrot qadoshi*) is a vague phrase for articulating what this space is since an adjective *qadoshi* here is used as an absolute adjective. So, the nuance of this term is similar to what *miqdash* is referring to as the sacred places where people worship YHWH. In the context of Trito-Isaiah, the term *qadoshi* modifies the noun *har* (Isa 56:7, 13; 65:11, 25; 66:20). So, we can presume that this adnoun would be a shortened form of *har-qadoshi*, which means the holy mountain, where the building project was delayed after dedicating the foundation with an altar (Ezra 3). Further, it is necessary to think of the plural form *chatzrot* in relation to the temple structure (c.f. Ezek. 9:7; 42:6; Ps. 84:2 (MT 3); 92:13 (MT 14); 116:19; 1Chr. 28:6, 12; 2Chr 23:5; 33:5). During the time before the monarchy, there was a single courtyard with an open space between the liturgical tent and the outer wall in the tabernacle structure (*chatzer hamishkan* in Exo 27:9; *bechatzer ‘ohel-mo’ed* in Lev 6:9, 19; c.f. Num 3:26). In this space, the altar and the laver were located for performing animal

sacrifices. The Solomonic Temple was surrounded by two walls, which is called the inner court (the open space within the interior wall) and the outer court (the open space between the exterior wall and the interior wall). The expressions like *shetey chatzrot beit-yhwh* (two courts of the house of the Lord) in 2Kgs 21:5 and 23:12 imply that kind of twofold structure of the temple courts. The temple courts also appeared in the situation of Sukkot in Neh 8:16. During this fall festival, people made booths, where the grains and fruits were gathered after the fall harvest, not only on the roofs and in the courts of their personal houses, but also on the temple courts, the squares of the castle gates. If we take this image of the Sukkot festival, YHWH's description of the feast with those who harvest and gather is related to the Sukkot festival to celebrate the new year and new harvest. According to Ezra, the Sukkot is observed when Zerubbabel ben Shealtiel and Joshua ben Jehozadak arrived in Jerusalem even though the foundation of the temple was not yet built (Ezra 3:3-6).

5.1.8. 62:10-12 Announcement of Salvation for *Bat Zion*

62:10 Preparing the well-paved highway for the return of diaspora

62:11aa The speaker: introduction of YHWH's announcement

62:11ab-bb YHWH: announcement of salvation to *Bat Zion*

62:12a The speaker: expecting outcomes that they will be called Holy People (*'am-haqodesh*) and Redeemed of YHWH (*ge'uley yhwh*)

62:12b The speaker: expecting outcomes that you will be called Sought Out (*derushah*) and City Not Forsaken (*'ir lo' ne'ezabah*)

62:10 The anonymous speaker concludes his speech by describing the salvation for the returning community in vv. 10-12 except for YHWH's announcement of salvation to *Bat Zion* in v.11ab-bb. Unlike the watchmen who are emphasized in verses 6-7, now the speaker is focused

on the builders who cast their glances up the highway looking for the people (*ha'am*), which means the rest of the exilic people coming. It implies that Jerusalem is still under construction. If we read this with the scene of theophany in 63:1-6, the highway is not only for the returning exiles but also for YHWH who coming back from the south (Hab 3:3; c.f. Obad 1:8-9; Jer 49:7). The use of the highway metaphor here is the continuation of the previous highway metaphor in transitional chapters like ch. 35 and ch. 40 (c.f. 43:5-7; 49:11-12). These builders also will lift a banner (*nes*) up for all people (*ha'amim*) on the earth. Isa 5:26 shows YHWH raises his banner (*nes*) up to call nations far away (*goyim merachok*) to punish unfaithful Judah and Jerusalem. This image is reversed in the Deutero-Isaiah in the context of restoration: when YHWH lifts up his banner (*nes*), all nations (*goyim*) and peoples (*'amim*) will bow down and serve for returnees (Isa 49:22). The anonymous speaker here follows this Deutero-Isaianic line of thoughts. Therefore the group of peoples (*'amim*) in 10b is different from the people (*ha'am*) in 10a. While the former means the outgroup, the latter means the ingroup.

62:11 The anonymous speaker begins to introduce the idea that YHWH will make all people, even those who are living at the end of the earth (*qetzeh ha'aretz*), hear his announcement in v.11aa. This speaker does not follow any formal prophetic formula to deliver divine messages. The expression *qetzeh ha'aretz* is found when the salvific song for praising divine ministry delivering the exilic people is proclaimed to the end of the earth (Isa 48:20 and 49:6). Here YHWH announces for *Bat Zion*, and then she is described as the recipient of his reward (*sekar*) and recompense (*pe'ulato*) (c.f. Isa 40:10).

62:12 This final verse describes how “they” will call the returning people and *Bat Zion*. This “they” refers to the peoples (*‘amim*), the outgroup. First, the returning people, who are referred to by the third person masculine plural pronoun, will be called Holy People (*‘am-haqodesh*) and Redeemed of YHWH (*ge’uley yhw*). These names imply the role of YHWH the redeemer (*goel*) who delivered the exiles in the Deutero-Isaiah. Second, *Bat Zion*, who is referred to by the second-person feminine singular pronoun, will be called Sought Out (*derushah*) and City Not Forsaken (*‘ir lo’ ne’ezabah*). This is related to *Bat Zion*’s name which changes from Forsaken (*‘azubah*) and Desolate (*shemamah*) in 62:4.

5.2. Closing Remarks

Trito-Isaiah reveals his self-awareness as the crucial political-priestly leader for the returning community in the late sixth century of Persian Yehud. During that time, the Temple was under construction under the leadership of Zerubbabel ben Shealtiel and Joshua ben Jehozadak who are not recognized by Trito-Isaiah. Instead, this anonymous speaker nominates himself as the future leader for those who were returned from Babylon to Yehud by using political-priestly languages. His narcissistic self-description as the future public leader is unlike the suffering servant who does not recognize the public in Deutero-Isaiah. Nevertheless, his message here is delivered in a monologic tone without any uses of prophetic and divine speech formula. It implies that he did not in reality reach his implied public audience.

Trito-Isaiah, who introduces himself as herald, healer, and liberator, appoints all returnees (61:1-6), the speaker himself (61:10-11), and *Bat Zion* and its watchmen (62:1-12). The

eternal covenant (*berit olam*) is bestowed upon and renewed with the returnees, This implies that the returning community inherits the orthodoxy and legitimacy of the land. Within this category of returnees, it includes the descendants of those who have non-Israelite origin who had been serving the monarch and also who were exiled with the Judean ruling class. From this perspective, it distinguishes them (including the speaker) from those who have not been exiled but who continued living on the land. In this respect, the outgroup is considered as those who will serve the returnees who take the place of the ruling class of Yehud in Isa 61:5. However, the hostility against the outgroup also is maintained, so eventually, the speaker excludes them from the community in 62:8b-9. This antagonism is aligned with how his interpretive community images the land as an empty space with ignorance of others who already had been living even after the fall of Jerusalem.

The problem is, his idea is not consistent thematically with what is delivered in 56:1-8 and 66:1-24 in the final form of Trito-Isaiah. According to the modern understanding of human reason, logical inconsistencies are regarded as signs of a different line of thought. However, the experimental point of view on human conception allows for the coexistence of different and even contradictory concepts in one's mind. As we discussed in the previous chapter, the population of postexilic Yehud is composed not only of returning immigrants but also native inhabitants who have various origins. The anonymous speaker in the pair of bookends here recognizes this outgroup and welcomes particularly the pious others who follow YHWH.

Chapter Six

Prophetic Announcement to Certain Audience in 56:1-8

56:1-8 is the prologue of the final form of Trito-Isaiah. 56:1-8 provides a theological framework for the reader with the epilogue in chs. 65-66. The pair of bookends recognizes and welcomes the pious YHWH-fearing people within the outgroup. The message here is represented as what YHWH speaks to the audiences by using prophetic speech formulas. The attitude of the outgroup is contradictory to what the speaker delivers in chs. 61-62 in a monologic tone. Structurally, 56:1-8 will be divided into three subsections: 1) Instruction and Beatitude (56:1-3); 2) Promises (56:4-7); and 3) Oracle (56:8).

6.1. Exegesis

6.1.1. 56:1-3 Instruction and Beatitude

56:1a Prophetic messenger formula (*ko amar adonai*)

56:1b Prophetic Torah on justice (*mishpat*) and righteousness (*tzedakah*) with salvation oracle

56:2a Beatitude (*ashrei*) for those who keep divine righteousness (*tzedakah*)

56:2b Beatitude (*ashrei*) for those who observe Sabbath

56:3a Quotation from the foreigner (*ben-hanekar*) who are joining with YHWH but worrying about separation

56:3b Quotation from the eunuch (*saris*) who calls himself a dry tree.

56:1 Here the speaker begins with the prophetic messenger formula to deliver YHWH's message to the audience (v.1a), unlike the case of chs. 61-62 in which the speaker proclaims and describes himself as the political-priestly leader for the returnees in monologic tones. In other

words, the anonymous speaker here uses formal prophetic language to perform the intermediary role between YHWH and his people. The text following YHWH's speech in v.1b-3 is composed of instruction and beatitude. With the divine salvation oracle, v.1b stresses the observance of divine justice (*mishpat*) and righteousness (*tzedakah*). This is the prophetic instruction, which is "a pedagogy to explain the divine will and to exhort its audience to observe divine expectations."¹ This text deals with justice (*mishpat*) and righteousness (*tzedakah*), which are indispensable and responsible components of the covenantal relationship with YHWH. Rendtorff observes how the text here links justice (*mishpat*) and righteousness (*tzedakah*) with salvation (*yeshu'ah*). While Proto-Isaiah highlights justice and righteousness and Deutero-Isaiah does the same for righteousness and salvation, Trito-Isaiah synthesizes these three terms.² These three terms provide a basis for the following beatitude.

56:2 This verse begins with *ashrei*, so it reminds us of Psalms 1 and 2. As Torah Psalm 1 promises that those who delight in and meditate on the divine Torah all day and night will be blessed, in contrast to those who do not (c.f. Ps. 19; 119). While Psalm 1 focuses on the observance of Torah in an individual's manner of living, the following royal Psalm 2 expands its attention to the monarchic community in Zion with a macroscopic worldview. The King of Zion is anointed and enthroned by YHWH, so kings of all nations should fear and follow YHWH and his chosen king of Zion. *Ashrei* in Psalms 1:1 and 2:12 functions as an inclusion to highlight and

¹ Marvin Sweeney views that the Book of Isaiah has the characteristic of the prophetic Torah. See his "The Prophets and the Prophetic Books, Prophetic Circles and Traditions," in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 3.2: 512; and "The Portrayal of Assyria in the Books of Kings," in *The Bible as a Human Witness to Divine Revelation: Hearing the Word of God through Historically Dissimilar Traditions*, ed. Randall Heskett and Brian Irwin, LHBOTS 469 (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 274.

² Rendtorff, *Canon and Theology*, 181-89.

bless those who follow YHWH and his instruction. In this vein, *ashrei* here in Isaiah 56:2a has a didactic purpose to make his audience follow divine instruction along with what he mentions in v.1b. Since the demonstrative pronoun as a single form *zo't* refers to righteousness (*tzedakah*), now YHWH blesses those who keep his righteousness in v. 2a. Verse 2b provides a more specific picture of them as those who observe Sabbath.³

Sabbath is one of the regular religious ceremonies like Olah Tamid (daily burnt offerings; Num 28:1-8) and Rosh Chodesh (monthly ceremony of the new moon; Num 28:11-15). Sabbath is observed on every seventh day of the Jewish calendar by having rest from the sunset of Friday evening to sunset of Saturday evening (Exo 23:12-13; Lev 23:3; Num 28:9-10) to remember and celebrate divine creation (Exo 20:8-11). However, this is not aligned only with creation tradition but also with Exo 1. Deuteronomy describes it as the day of remembering how YHWH saved his people from being slaves in the land of Egypt (Deut 5:12-15). The observance of the Sabbath is the sign of the eternal covenant (*berit olam*) between YHWH and the people of Israel (Exo 31:12-17). The conflict raised by the food deprivation in the wilderness is ultimately related to the observance of the Sabbath (Exo 16:21-30). In the Book of Exodus, the emphasis on the Sabbath envelopes the story of the golden calf in Exo 31:12-17 and 35:1-3 (while it functions as the epilogue of the blueprint of Tabernacle and the prologue of the Tabernacle's construction.)

The reference to the Sabbath appears six times in the Book of Isaiah. Except for the case of Isa 1:13, which criticizes hypocritical practices and observance of religious traditions without

³ Blessing for those who keep the Sabbath is mentioned only in Trito-Isaiah. Dong-Hyuk Kim, “제 3 이사야의 안식일 신학: 이사야 56 장 1-8 절과 58 장 13-14 절에 대한 주석적 연구 [The Sabbath in Third Isaiah: An Exegetical Study of Isa 56:1-8 and 58:13-14]” *KJOTS* 24.2 (2018), 30.

authenticity, the rest of the five cases appear in Trito-Isaiah, (56:2, 4, 6; 58:13; 66:23). So, one-half of all cases belong to Isa 56:1-8. Although Deutero-Isaiah describes the end of Babylonian captivity and the following return of the exiles to their homeland as though it was equal in importance to a second creation and second exodus (Isa 43:1-7, 14-21; 50:2; 51:9-11), it does not refer to Sabbath as a religious holiday.⁴ However, we can say that the Deutero-Isaian theology of the second creation and exodus impacts the theological emphasis of Sabbath in Trito-Isaiah, which is related to the priestly amateurism during the delayed temple construction in the late sixth century B.C.E.

For example, Sabbath in 58:13-14 is mentioned with the theme of fasting in 58:1-7. Fasting and Sabbath are paralleled in terms of the stress of liturgical restoration while people pursue their own business (*chepetz* in Isa 58:3, 13). In the case of fasting, Trito-Isaiah criticizes those who lose the authentic faith while on the outside they pretend to honor liturgical practice. Fasting was observed in the exilic community for mourning and lamenting for the national humiliation in 587/6. Zechariah describes the postexilic Yehud community's observance of the fasting ceremony in the fourth month, fifth month (Tisha B'Av), seventh month, and tenth month over a period of seventy years (Zech 7:4-5; 8:19; c.f. Jer 25:11-12; 29:10; 2Chr 36:21; Dan 9:2). This continues during the period of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezra 8:21, 23; Neh 1:4; 9:1). In the case of Neh 9:1, communal fasting was practiced when people renewed the covenant with YHWH on the twenty-fourth day of the seventh month. However, fasting in Trito-Isaiah and Zechariah is mentioned not in connection with covenantal renewal but for the purpose of criticizing

⁴ Cho, *Myth, History, and Metaphor*, 146-7.

hypocritical worshippers. Both point out that people observe the fasting rituals not for YHWH but to promote the people's own business (Isa 58:3-5; Zech 7:5-6). Zechariah proclaims that fasting will be changed from a day of sorrow to a day of delight while he envisages the eschatological pilgrimage of all nations to Zion (Zech 8:19-23). Unlike Zechariah, Trito-Isaiah emphasizes that fasting should be restored in terms of the authentic practice of YHWH's instructions to proclaim liberation for the poor and needy (Isa 58:6-7).

Even though fasting is not mentioned in all postexilic literature, evidence indicates that people did not much care about religious duties at that time.⁵ The use of *shepetz* (Isa 58:3, 13) implies that the people of Yehud did not fully care for religious duties like fasting and *Sabbath* since they were concerned about their bread-and-butter economy (Hag 1:4). Further, political-priestly amateurism plays a part to strengthen this situation. The description of Joshua the high priest pointed out that he was wearing filthy clothes (Zech 3:3-4). In Hag 2:10-14, Haggai taught the liturgical law to priests catechetically. This amateurism continued to be problematic until Nehemiah's second term in the governor's office (Mal 1:6-2:9; Zech 9:1-2; 10:18-19, 23-24; Neh 13:4-14, 28-30). Nehemiah educated people about the meaning of the Sabbath (Neh 9:14) and asked them to honor their religious duties in light of YHWH's instruction (Neh 10:31). However, even after his second term, Sabbath was not fully observed since people carried on their own business (Neh 13:15-22). For this reason, Nehemiah appointed Levite gatekeepers (*hasha'arim*) to oversee the unlawful business on Sabbath (Neh 13:19-22). These gatekeepers' role was to guard the castle door and catch any merchants who tried to enter Jerusalem on the Sabbath. So, it

⁵ Haggai and Malachi do not mention fasting and Sabbath. Zechariah and Ezra do not mention Sabbath.

was different from what the Levite gatekeepers did in the Tabernacle or the Temple (c.f. 1Chr 9:17-27; 26:1-19) and how Ezekiel envisions Levite gatekeepers as those who serve the Zadokite priesthood in the Temple (Ezek 44:11-14). Because of the Sabbath, some scholars prefer to deal with Trito-Isaiah as one of Nehemiah's contemporaries, but Trito-Isaiah never mentions Levite gatekeepers for the castle or even for the Temple.⁶

56:3 By quoting the lament of the foreigner (*ben-hanekar*) and the eunuch (*saris*), YHWH confirms their status within the YHWH-believing community. If we read *ben-hanekar* (or *bene-hanekar* in plural) literally, it means son or descendant of the foreigner. However, since this term is used in parallel with the *bene israel* (son of Israel) in Ezek 44:9. It reads as referencing the foreigner in general. Here the foreigner is described as those who join him to YHWH (*hannilwah el-yhwh*) (v.6 uses plural). The niphal form of the verb *lawah* (to be joined) modifies the subject *ger* in Isa 14:1. This resident alien is paralleled with foreign peoples (*amim*) who will serve the people of Israel who come back to their homeland (Isa 14:2). So the nationalistic restoration envisions that foreigners will be subject to the house of Jacob. Zech 2:11 (MT 2:15) also foresees that many nations (*goyim rabbim*) will be joined to YHWH on the day of YHWH (*yom yhwh*). The text here follows this line of thought.

⁶ Sweeney and Yang consider that Trito-Isaiah is the contemporary of Nehemiah because he has the same standpoints on Sabbath with Nehemiah. Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 53. Inchol Yang, "Understanding Isa 56:1-8 in light of the Sabbath Text in Neh 13:15-22" *KJCS* 117 (2020), 49. Taek-Joo Woo and Won-Je Jung also hold the view that Trito-Isaiah is more close to the context of Ezra and Nehemiah concerning the tension between the enfranchised Aaronade/Zadokite and the disenfranchized Levities. Taek-Joo Woo and Won-Je Jung, "제 3 이사야서의 배경에서 본 이사야 6 장의 내러티브 비평 [Narrative Critical Reading of Isaiah 6 in a Socio-Historical Context of Third Isaiah (Chs. 56-66)]" *TF* 65 (2011), 130; However, Dong-Hyuk Kim dates Trito-Isaiah the period after the completion of the Second Temple, but before the time of Nehemiah, even though the observance of Sabbath does not have to be bound to the certain location for those who lost the First Temple and the land. Kim, "The Sabbath in Third Isaiah," 23, 30.

According to Deut 23:3-6, Ammonites and Moabites are not available to join the assembly of God (*qahal yhwh*). Nevertheless, if certain conditions are met, some foreigners are able to join the divine assembly. In the case of Edomites and Egyptians, joining was allowed for those who come after the third generation (Deut 23:7-8). When YHWH set circumcision as the sign of the eternal covenant (*berit olam*) with Abraham and his household, it is ordered that “those who bought with your money from any foreigner who is not of your offspring” should also be circumcised (Gen 17:12, 27). Exo 12:48-49 and Num 9:14 identify them as *ger*: “the stranger who sojourns among you (*welager hagar betokkem*).” If they want to observe Passover, all males of *ger* should be circumcised like the native of the land (*‘ezrach ha’arets*) does. Therefore *gerim* who are staying in the land have the responsibility to follow divine instructions (Exo 12:19; Lev 16:29; 17:15; 18:34; Num 15:14, 29-31; Josh 8:33). The instruction in Lev 19:33-34 orders that people of Israel should take care of *ger* among their community because they were *gerim* in the land of Egypt. We see several cases of non-Israelites who follow Yahwistic faith: Melchizedek the king of Salem (Gen 14:18), Eliezer of Damascus (Gen 15:2), Rabab of Jericho (Josh 2:11), Ruth the Moabite (Ruth 1:16), Naaman the commander of Aram-Damascus (2Kgs 5:17), Ebed-Melech the Cushite (Jer 39:16-18), and Ninevites (Jonah 3:4-10). As we mentioned in the previous chapter, the court and temple servants who had non-Israelite origins like Nethinim are also included in this category.

Some literally read *ben-hanekar* (*bene hanekar* in plural) in v.3a here and identify them as the temple servants during the monarchic period.⁷ However, there are not enough clues to

⁷ Biblical Committee of Catholic Bishops' Conference of Korea, 주석성경 [*Juseokseonggyeong*] (Seoul: Catholic Bishops' Conference of Korea, 2010; based on *TOB*) (Online)

identify them with Nethinim who has foreign origins and can be included in the list of returnees. (1Chr 9:2; Ezra 2:43-54, 58, 70; 7:7; 8:17). If we consider *ben-hanekar* in Ezek 44:7-9 as those who are not circumcised within the Israelite community, it is not clear whether to view *ben-hanekar* in Isa 56:3a, 6 as foreign people who are circumcised according to the divine instructions. Steven S. Tuell read *ben-hanekar* in Isa 56:3, 6 in light of Ezek 44:7-9.⁸ As Hanson does, he views this group as non-Zadokite Levites who had tension with the Zadokite priesthood.⁹ However, there is not enough evidence of inner conflict within the priestly circle since Trito-Isaiah does not mention Levites (or Levite gatekeepers) in 56:1-8.

Here *ben-hanekar* is worrying about the separation from his lament “the Lord will surely separate me from his people.” The hiphil verb form *badal* is used in priestly literature like Leviticus and Ezekiel to distinguish the holy and the profane, the clean and unclean liturgically (Lev 10:10; 11:47; 20:25; Ezek 22:26; 42:20). The quotation implies that converted male foreigners are already aware of those liturgical restrictions. Therefore they were positioned in between as marginalized beings within Yahwistic community. Following Deut 23:3-6, Nehemiah also uses this hiphil form of *badal*. He separates the mixed people (including Ammonites and Moabites) from the congregation before Nehemiah’s on-leave in the flow of narrative (Neh 13:1-

<https://bible.cbck.or.kr/Knbnotes/Bible/Ls/56>.

⁸ However, Nathan MacDonald disagrees with interpreting Isa 56 as the response to Ezek 44: “I want to argue that, contra Tuell, Schaper, and Fishbane, Ezekiel 44 has drawn upon Isaiah 56, and not the reverse.” Nathan MacDonald, *Priestly Rule*, 32. c.f. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 257-68; Joachim Schaper, “Rereading the Law: Inner-Biblical Exegesis of Divine Oracles in Ezechiel 44 and Isaiah 56,” in *Recht und Ethik im Alten Testament*, ed. B. M. Levison and E. Otto (Münster: LIT-Verlag, 2004), 125-44.

⁹ Steven S. Tuell, “The Priesthood of the ‘Foreigner’: Evidence of Competing Politics in Ezekiel 44:1-14 and Isaiah 56:1-18,” in *Constituting the Community Studies on the Polity of Ancient Israel in Honor of S. Dean McBride, Jr.*, ed. John T. Strong and Steven S. Tuell (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005). Yang and Chae also follow this opinion.

3).¹⁰ However, this policy of ethnic separation is more strict than what Nehemiah did against those who married foreign women during Nehemiah's second term (Neh 13:23-30).¹¹ Even though Nehemiah and Trito-Isaiah share the hiphil form of *badal*, it is hard to put them in the same time frame. Instead, as discussed in Chapter Five, the socio-economic position of *ben-hanekar* as described by the anonymous speaker in chs. 61-62 should be noted.

In. v.3b, *saris* laments that he is a “dry tree.” The eunuch is usually identified with those who closely guard and serve the royal courts and do not have any family members in the ancient Near Eastern culture. It is possible to read this as a general case of Potiphar (Gen 37:36; 39:1),¹² Piotr Bienkowski notes that it is a later development.

The Akkadian term *ša rēši*, is usually translated as ‘eunuch,’ although its literal meaning is ‘(One) of Head,’ that is, ‘Chief,’ and some scholars think that it referred simply to somebody belonging to the royal entourage. It was a title for an official, attendant, soldier or officer, and it is possible that the specific meaning ‘eunuch’ developed later. However, it has been proposed that *ša rēši* originally meant ‘the one with two heads,’ a euphemism for ‘the one without two heads,’ where the two heads stood for the two (mutilated) testicles. The Hebrew word *saris* is thought to derive from *ša rēši*, and in the Bible it can mean either a court official or a eunuch.¹³

During the monarchic period, eunuchs served the Israelite and Judean courts.¹⁴ Two names are mentioned as eunuchs in the Davidic court: Nathan-melech in Josiah's court (2Kgs

¹⁰ H. G. M. Williamson prefers to connect “mixed people” in relation to mixed marriage, but Jacob M. Myers generalizes this term as the exclusion of all foreigners. Jacob M. Myers, *Ezra-Nehemiah*: AB 14 (New York: Doubleday: 1965), 27-8; H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra-Nehemiah*. WBC 16 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), 385-6.

¹¹ Trito-Isaiah here targets the conversion of the foreign men, not the ethnic separation and the mixed marriage.

¹² Following rabbinic tradition (b. Sot 13b), James Kugel views that Potiphar is identified with the Potiphara, the father of Aseneth. James C. Kugel, *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1990), 13-15.

¹³ Piotr Bienkowski, “Eunuchs,” in *Dictionary of the Ancient Near East*, ed. Piotr Bienkowski and Alan Millard (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 110.

¹⁴ P. Kyle McCarter Jr. “Biblical Detective Work Identifies the Eunuch” *BAR* 28.2 (2002), 46-48.

23:11) and Ebed-melech the Cushite in Zedekiah's court (Jer 38:7). Ebed-melech is the typical example of a converted foreigner who served as a eunuch for the royal courts during the monarchic period. After he rescued Jeremiah from the pit in the prison court, YHWH promised him that he would be safely delivered from the Babylonian army (Jer 38:7-13; 39:17-18). Isaiah prophesied that some of the members of the Davidic dynasty would be eunuchs for the Babylonian court (2Kgs 20:18; Isa 39:7), but there is no evidence of any descendant of David who became a Babylonian eunuch. We only know that eunuchs in his courts were also deported into Babylon when Jehoiachin was captured into Babylon (2Kgs 24:12, 15). Since eunuchs are unable to beget children, there cannot be descendants of eunuchs who continued in that position after the Babylonian captivity. Furthermore, Yehud was a minor subprovince of the Persian Empire. According to Bienkowski, eunuchs in the Persian courts were selected from castrated male children of noble families in the satrapies. They were "loyal because they had no other ties or affections."¹⁵ Here the eunuch who laments him as "a dry tree (*etz yabesh*)" would be regarded as one who relates to high court officials who serve the Persian administration in Yehud, whether that one does or does not have Jewish heritage. Following Charles F. Fensham (1982) and Mark A. Throntveit (1992), In-chol Yang presumes that Nehemiah was not only a cupbearer but also a eunuch. In this vein, he views Trito-Isaiah as the contemporary of Nehemiah since he evaluates the eunuch positively in Isa 56:3-4.¹⁶ However, if we consider how the eunuch laments himself as "a dry tree," it is hard to identify Nehemiah as "a dry tree" since he was the governor who took control of the Persian Yehud community. Even though his opponents in Neh.

¹⁵ Bienkowski, "Eunuchs", 110.

¹⁶ Yang, "Understanding Isa 56:1-8", 61-4

6 tried to pull down his leadership, their blame was rooted in the power game, not his legitimacy of being in the community.

Calling the eunuch “a dry tree (*etz yabesh*)” implies his marginalized status within the Yahwistic community.¹⁷ Even though the eunuch is not specifically mentioned, Deut 23:1 clearly states that one whose testicles are crushed or whose male organ is cut off should not be in the assembly of YHWH. Sexually disabled people are considered unclean in Lev 21:20 and 22:24. For these reasons, the euphemistic expression like “a dry tree” implies self-deprecation of eunuchs who follow YHWH to show they were incapable of having a child and of being members of a divine community even though they took the higher ranking position in the Persian administration.¹⁸ Therefore, it is the voice of marginalized beings like the case of the foreigner (*ben hanekar*) who joined YHWH.

YHWH, who quotes the lament from those marginalized beings, proclaims “let me not say that” in the jussive form at the beginning of verse 3. So, he reveals their marginalized status in the community throughout the quotations but also implies that there is no need of being in the status quo in the jussive mood. In this vein, those marginalized beings who joined YHWH are contrasted with one who is profaning the Sabbath in 2a and 6. This will be more clearly specified in the following verses 4-7.

¹⁷ In the Book of Ezekiel, this expression “a dry tree (*etz yabesh*)” is used in the context of judgment (one should be burnt up entirely; Ezek 20:47 = MT 21:3) and restoration (one should grow thick again; Ezek 17:24) both. Following Ruszkowski’s view of *saris* as the symbolic term for the dynasty, Hee-Sook Bae views that the lament of *saris* would be linked with the present status of Israelites that cannot restore the Davidic dynasty. Hee-Sook Bae, “이사야 56 장 1-8 절의 재건공동체 [The Restoration Community in Isaiah 56, 1-8]” *KPJT* 39 (2010), 26-7.

¹⁸ Gale A. Yee, “Of Foreigners and Eunuchs: An Asian American Reading of Isa. 56:1-8,” in *T&T Clark Handbook of Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics*, ed. Uriah Y. Kim and Seung Ai Yang (New York: T&T Clark, 2019), 263-64.

6.1.2. 56:4-7 Promise

56:4aa Prophetic messenger formula (*ko amar adonai*)

56:4ab-bb Object 1: For eunuchs (*sarisim*) who observes Sabbath and keeps covenant with YHWH

56:5 Promise 1: the bestowal of the monument and name (*yad vashem*), esp. eternal name (*shem olam*) that will not cut off

56:6 Object 2: foreigners (*bene hanekar*) who observes Sabbath and keeps covenant with YHWH

56:7 Promise 2: the invitation to the house of prayer (*beit tefilah*) at the Holy Mountain (*har qadoshi*)

Verses 4-7 is the additional explanation of YHWH's "let me not say that." It consists of the hopeful promises for foreigners and eunuchs. The prophetic messenger formula (*ko amar adonai*) in 4aa notices that the second divine speech begins from the prophetic mouth. Verses 4ab-5 is about eunuchs (*sarisim*), vv. 6-7 is about foreigners (*bene hanekar*). However it does not target all eunuchs and foreigners in general, but it specifically sets limits with the certain modifying phrase "who observes Sabbath...keeps covenant with YHWH." In other words, the divine promise here is bestowed on those who follow YHWH. The terms like Sabbath and covenant are modified with first-person genitive within divine speech that the prophet delivers. So these are described as belonging to YHWH himself.

56:4-5 Trito-Isaiah uses the term covenant in various ways. As we've mentioned in the previous chapter, this term in 61:8 is limited to the returnees while the speaker follows the Deutero-Isaian collective memory. However, the covenant in 59:20-21 is more specified as "those in Jacob who turn from transgression" within the ministry of YHWH the redeemer (*goel*). This change implies the reality of a syncretist who makes a covenant with other gods besides YHWH in 57:8. Therefore, the covenant in 56:4 and 6 should be understood in this vein. This

term is redefined for the marginalized beings like foreigners and eunuchs, whether one has a higher social ranking in the public or not, within the Yahwistic community. It is possible to say that Trito-Isaiah experiences the radical transformation of his definition of the covenant with consideration of historical progress. However, the problem is that the final form of Trito-Isaiah shows the inner-contradiction of those definitions in the raw.

It is uncertain whether the redefined definition of the covenant in 56: 4, 6 means the banishing of the circumcision tradition and acceptance of those marginalized into the priesthood. The mention of *sarisim* refers to their infertile status, not of the circumcision since there is no mention of circumcision in the Trito-Isaiah.¹⁹ The text does not deny or reject covenantal conditions like Sabbath and circumcision even though it uses teleological views to highlight free will by the expression like “one who chooses the things that please me.” The euphemistic phrase “a monument and a name (*yad washem*) better than sons and daughters” implies the infertile status of *sarisim* who are incapable of having a child. Similar usage is found in Absalom’s story in 2Sam 18:18. Absalom set a stone pillar (*matzevah*) called “the hand of Absalom (*yad ‘abshalom*)” to commemorate his name since he did not have any child to continue his name.²⁰ Standing *matzevah* is not only found in references to worshipping YHWH (Gen 28:18, 22; 31:13; 35:14; Exo 24:4; Isa 19:19, c.f. Josh 4:7-9, 20-21 ⇔ Lev 26:1; Deut 16:22; Hos 3:4), but also when commemorating someone and some event in common life (Gen 31:45; 35:20). Therefore, even though the speaker here does not mention *matzevah* specifically, setting “a

¹⁹ Chae, 178. Deutero-Isaiah asserts that “the uncircumcised and the unclean” will not enter into Jerusalem again (Isa 52:1).

²⁰ Izaak. J. de Hulster, *Iconographic Exegesis and Third Isaiah*, FAT 2.36 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 168. However, the report in 2Sam 18:18 does not fit with 2Sam 14:27. The genealogy of Abshalom (or Abishalom?) is very vague (1Kgs 15:2; 10).

monument and a name (*yad washem*) would be linked with the ceremony of commemoration. According to Bienkowski, the Assyrian king had “full authority over a deceased eunuch’s estate and was responsible for his burial.”²¹ Here YHWH also takes this responsibility for eunuchs who follow him by promising “an everlasting name (*shem olam*) that shall not be cut off.” So, they can be continuously remembered within the Yahwistic community.

56:6 The foreigners who minister (*bene hanekar*) are described as YHWH’s servants (*abadim*) to minister and love the divine name (c.f. Ps 5:11; 69:36; 119:132). The verb *sharat* is used not only for serving ministry to the senior (1Kgs 1:4, 15; 19:21), but also for priestly works (Exo 28:35, 43; 29:30; Num 4:12; 8:26; 16:9; Deut 10:8; 17:12; 18:5; 21:5; 1Kgs 8:11; Ezek 40:46; 43:19; 44:11). Blenkinsopp notes that “the conclusion is unavoidable that people of foreign descent are considered by the prophetic author to be eligible for the priestly office and therefore the sacrifices mentioned are sacrifices they may offer as priests.”²² Tuell read the use of the verb *sharat* of Isa 56:6 in relation to its use of Ezek 44:11, then proposes that *bene hanekar* as non-Zadokite Levites since Ezekiel excludes them because of their impure status.²³ In a sense of exclusion, it is possible to say that Levites are alienated from the main priestly duties, which were performed by Aaronide-Zadokite *Kohanim*,²⁴ even though they were performing auxiliary roles in the Temple (Lev 18:1-32).²⁵ However, this does not mean that Levites actually came

²¹ Bienkowski, “Eunuchs”, 110.

²² Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66*, 140.

²³ Tuell, “The Priesthood of the ‘Foreigner,’” 187-202. Yang and Chae also follow this opinion.

²⁴ Mark Leuchter, “How All Kohanim Became Sons of Aaron” provided by TheTorah.com] <https://www.thetorah.com/article/how-all-kohanim-became-sons-of-aaron>.

²⁵ C.f. Jaeyoung Jeon, “The Levites and Idolatry: A Scribal Debate in Ezekiel 44 and Chronicles,” in *Chronicles and the Priestly Literature: Literary-Historical and Ideological Relationships between Chronicles, Ezekiel, and the Pentateuch*, ed. Jaeyoung Jeon and Louis Jonker, BZAW 528 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021).

from a foreign root who are uncircumcised. If Ezekiel's criticism in the temple vision implies what happened in the Solomonic Temple before when he was exiled with King Jehoiachin in 597/6, it is hard to say that uncircumcised foreigners were taking priestly and auxiliary jobs in the Temple. The second person plural pronoun in Ezek 44:7 refers to the house of Israel (*beit israel*) who brought the uncircumcised *bene hanekar* into the worship place in verse 6. So, the people of Israel are responsible to offer sacrifices like food, fat, and blood. The subject "them" of the verb *sharat* in Ezek 44:11 would be identical to the Levites since the target is specified from the people of Israel in general to the Levites. Num 8:5-26 clearly mentions that Levites are offered to YHWH as the wave offering to replace all firstborn children of the people of Israel (c.f. Exo 13:11-16). Therefore, it is hard to read the verb *sharat* of Isa 56:6 in reference to Ezek 44:11. Contrarily, the returnees in 61:6 are clearly described as the priesthood of YHWH (*kohaney yhwh*) and ministers of our God (*mesharetey 'eloheynu*).

It is difficult to figure out which role is designated for *bene hanekar* joined YHWH in Isa 56:6-7. If the tension between priests and auxiliaries might be implied, it is necessary to provide more detailed information for the definition of the covenant in Isa 56:4 as the case of reevaluating the Noahic covenant in Isa 54:9 and the Davidic covenant in Isa 55:3. If it shares the Levites' criticism against the priestly monopoly by Aaronides-Zadokite priesthood, the text should mention the "covenant with Phinehas" for targeting the priestly establishment (Num 25:11-13) or "covenant with Levi (*beriti 'el-lewi*)" to enhance their legitimacy (Mal 2:4-5; c.f. Mal 3:1-3). As we discussed above, such ideas and tensions are not implied when YHWH mentions the eunuchs and foreigners who observe Sabbath and keep the divine covenant in Isa

56:4 and 6. Even though Isa 66:21 mentions *kohanim* and *levi'im*, it does not discuss their ministry in detail.

Instead, it is necessary to focus on how *bene hanekar* joined YHWH to become his servants (*abadim*). Deutero-Isaiah focuses on the single form *ebed* who is suffering. This servant is identified with Israel in Isa 49:3. The plural form *abadim* is mentioned to envisage the restoration of future Jerusalem in Isa 54:17. However, the meaning of *ebed* or *abadim* has changed from Israel to the foreigners in the post-exilic context. Unlike Deutero-Isaiah which views Israel as the servant(s) of YHWH, chs. 60-62 are focused on the nationalistic restoration by the returnees while non-returnees become those who serve them. Isa 14:2, which is considered as postexilic redaction, clearly mentions that foreigners (including former oppressors) are *abadim* who serve the people of Israel. These non-returnees will become servants of Israel, so it does not mean that they can get the same position of *ebed* or *abadim* who serve YHWH in Deutero-Isaiah. It is unlikely that the perspective on the foreigners is shifted in Isa 56:6. The text here proposes that *bene hanekar* who joined YHWH will be the servants of YHWH, not the slaves of Israel. This idea is linked with pious *abadim* who fear the word of YHWH in 63:17; 65:8-9; 65:13-15 and 66:14.

56:7 YHWH continues to speak in the first person by using the conjunction *waw*. He delivers his promise for converted foreigners who are YHWH's *abadim*. They are referred to by the third person pronoun. Using a series of *waw*-consecutive perfect forms, he describes the liturgical space by using the future tense. So, YHWH will bring them to the sacred space and make them joyful. The expression of "holy mountain (*har qadeshi*)" is the metaphoric term to

refer to the holy space where the divine throne (*kapporet*), the lid of the ark of the covenant, was located (Ps 3:5; 15:1; 87:1; 99:9; Ezek 28:14) during the monarchic period. However, the ark of the covenant no longer is mentioned after Josiah's order to bring it back to the Solomonic Temple during the Passover (2Chr 35:3). Nevertheless, from the geographical perspective of postexilic people, the "holy mountain" refers to Mount Zion in Jerusalem (Isa 27:13, 66:20; Zech 8:3; Joel 3:17). So, this space is regarded as where the divine presence takes place. In Isa 65:11, forgetting the holy mountain (*hashkechim et-har qadeshi*) is parallel with forsaking YHWH (*'ozbey yhwh*).

The house of prayer (*beit-tepilah*) is parallelly introduced with the holy mountain (*har qadeshi*).” This title is introduced as the future name of the divine house by using the niphal imperfect verb “it will be called.” YHWH describes specifically this place where the burnt offering (*olah*) and sacrifices (*zebach*) will be accepted in the altar in the holy mountain. However, a detailed description of this building structure is not mentioned. A similar function of the temple as the place of prayer is found in King Solomon's prayer of dedication of the First Temple after the Ark of the Covenant moved in (1Kgs 8:41-43). This text mentions that the foreigners (*hanokri*), who come from far away, can pray toward the Temple for the sake of YHWH's name. Solomon beseeches YHWH to accept their prayer and make them worship YHWH like the people of Israel. The following verses say that Israelites, who are far away, can also pray toward the Temple for the sake of YHWH's name (1Kgs 8:44, 48). Therefore praying toward the Temple addresses the various contexts outside of the sacred place and the land of Israel.

Trito-Isaiah, however, goes further than this perspective. Isa 56:7 states that YHWH will directly bring the foreigners into the holy mountain and make them joyful within his future house of prayer by using the preposition *be*. It is regarded as referring to the worship by the pious converted foreigners in relation to the eschatological pilgrimage of all nations to Zion (Isa 2:2-4; Mic 4:1-5).²⁶ However, Trito-Isaiah keeps silent about the role of these converted foreigners in the worship place. Even though some scholars try to link them with priestly or auxiliary roles within the liturgical space, it is unclear whether to view them that way before we encounter the expanded use of *kohanim* and *levi'im* in 66:21. Whether they are leaders or followers in Yahwistic worship, the role of converted foreigners should be regarded comprehensively. On the contrary, Trito-Isaiah states that the returnees can take on the priestly role in 61:6. It implies that their roles cannot be limited to the priestly or auxiliary works.

Nevertheless, it is important that the converted foreigners will offer burnt offerings (*olah*) and sacrifices (*zebach*) with YHWH's acceptance (*leratzon*). Similar uses of *leratzon* are also found in Isa 60:5-9. While 60:5-9 highlights a nationalistic vision of eschatological pilgrimage to Zion, 56:7 expects that all nations will offer their wealth and riches for YHWH with his acceptance (*leratzon*) for glorifying his beautiful house (*beit tip'areti*). Sacrificial animals from the foreign people will be offered at the divine altar (contrast with Jer 6:20). However, the role of foreigners is limited to offering tributes to Zion, not participating in the Temple liturgy. This is linked with how Isa 61-62 describes them as the outgroup from the perspective of returnees.

²⁶ Bae proposes that 56:1-8 is dated during the situation between 538 and 515 since the vision of house of prayer for the converted foreigners is futuristic and eschatological as the response to the imperfect form of lament by the converted foreigners. Bae, "The Restoration Community," 25, 29.

6.1.3. 56:8 Oracle

56:8a Oracle formula (*neum adonai yhwh meqabetz nidchei Israel*)

56:8b Oracular statement that YHWH will gather more beside the returnees.

56:8a The final divine speech is introduced with the oracle formula “*neum adonai yhwh.*”

Here YHWH is described as the one who gathers the banished (men) of Israel (*meqabetz nidchei Israel*).” In Isa 11:12, “the banished (men) of Israel (*nidchei Israel*)” is parallel with “the scattered (women) of Judah (*niputzot yehudah*)” in Isa 11:12.²⁷ So, we can presuppose that the above-mentioned term is not limited to a certain gender. The term *nidchei Israel* is also found in Ps 147:2. Gathering the banished men of Israel is parallel with building up Jerusalem. In this vein, we can say that this term refers to diaspora Israel in general during the time of reconstruction.

56:8b It is YHWH’s final speech in the first person. It implies that more people will be brought back to YHWH by using the particle ‘*od* with the sense of “more.” Even though it is difficult to figure out who they are, this group of “more” would be distinguished from “those who already gathered (*leniqbtazyw*).” The problem is the reading of ‘*alayw* which is constructed of the preposition ‘*al* and its third-person masculine singular suffix because its number does not match with the following niphil masculine plural participle *leniqbtazyw*. This would be resolved to read that this singular pronoun refers to the following plural term. In this vein, Sweeney read v.8b as “I will gather more to those already gathered.”²⁸ In this vein, “those who already

²⁷ Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66*, 141.

²⁸ Sweeney, *Isaiah 40-66*, 251; JPS TANAKH read, “I will gather still more to those already gathered.” Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler, eds., *The Jewish Study Bible: JPS TANAKH Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 896.

gathered” refers to those who returned from Babylonian captivity during the late sixth century. The group of “more” that YHWH will gather (*‘od ‘aqabetz*) is not included within this community of returnees. If we consider the group of “more” as non-returnees, it should be listed not only as converted foreigners and eunuchs abovementioned, but also as those who have not returned yet from various Jewish diaspora contexts. The YHWH’s ministry of gathering “more” is described in 66:18-19.

6.2. Closing Remarks

Trito-Isaiah’s message is delivered indirectly to his audience by relying on the authority of YHWH using the prophetic messenger and oracle formula. Quotations from a eunuch (*saris*) and a foreigner (*ben hanekar*) in YHWH’s speech imply that this anonymous speaker is recognized by his audience. The target here is specified as the group of converted eunuchs and foreigners, but it does not mean that they share monarchic heritage. This group should be distinguished from those who have non-Israelite ancestors who had served for the monarch and were exiled into Babylon. There are two reasons. First, eunuchs were not incapable of having a biological child to continue their bloodline. Second, foreigners (*ben hanekar*) would be considered uncircumcised in Ezek 44: 7, 9. Their worries of separation imply that they already know of Deut. 23:1-8. Even though Neh 13:1-3 also mentions Deuteronomic separation, this is not enough for presuming to put Trito-Isaiah in the same timeline. Following verses of Neh 13:4-31 shows that exogamists are excluded from the community while the Levite gatekeepers

oversee Sabbath during his second term. However, Trito-Isaiah keeps silent about exogamous marriage and Levite gatekeepers.

Eunuchs and foreigners who follow YHWH here are described as those who hold the divine covenant by observing Sabbath. These groups are contrasted with those who practice Sabbath with amateuristic manners during the time of the delayed temple construction. YHWH invites them into the house of prayer (*beit tefilah*) at the Holy Mountain (*har qadoshi*). During the monarchic period, praying toward the Temple is related to those who are coming from the outside of the land of Israel or who are staying there (1Kgs 8:41ff). Here YHWH led the converted outsiders into Zion and allowed them to offer burnt offerings and sacrifices on his altar. However, their role in the worship place is not specified. The final oracle in v. 8 implies that YHWH will gather more people, including not only the converted foreigners but also those who have not returned yet from various Jewish diaspora contexts. This radical vision will be continued and developed in 66:1-24. However, it is very different from Trito-Isaiah's monologic self-proclamation in chs. 61-62.

Chapter Seven

Prophetic Announcement to a Pious Audience in 66:1-24

Chapter 66 is the extension of chapter 65. Both 65 and 66 are regarded as the conclusion (epilogue) of Trito-Isaiah. Usually, many scholars view ch. 66 part of 56:1-8 because it shares inclusive views of foreigners who fear YHWH. While 56:1-8 admits that converted foreigners who become YHWH worshippers can enter into the worship place to offer sacrifices, 66:1-24 expands their roles as priests and Levites who serve in the holy places. It is different from the nationalistic tendency on returnees in chs. 61-62 discussed in Chapter Five.

7.1. Exegesis

7.1.1. 66:1-4 Announcement of Restoration of the Trembler and Judgment against the Wicked

66:1aa Prophetic messenger formula (*ko amar adonai*)

66:1ab-2aa YHWH as the creator who is not limited by the temple building.

66:2ab Close Oracle formula (*neum yhwh*)

66:2b Announcement of restoration for the tremblers (*haredim*)

66:3a Reason for judgment 1: the false ritual by the wicked

66:3b-4aa Announcement of judgment against the wicked

66:4ab-b Reason for judgment 2: They choose what they want to without answering and hearing from YHWH.

66:5a Call to attention to the tremblers (*haredim*)

66:5ba Description of the wicked who hates and casts out the trembler

66:5bb Quotation from the wicked

66:5bc YHWH's announcement of judgment

66:6a Sounds from the city and the temple (*heykal*)

66:6b Sound of YHWH who does recompense against his enemies.

66:1-2a v.1aa begins with a typical prophetic messenger formula (*ko amar adonai*). Like 56:1-8 does, it implies that an anonymous prophet speaks for YHWH in public. In v. 1ab, YHWH describes himself as the creator of the whole universe, who made sky to be his throne (*kis 'iy*) and the earth to be his footstool (*hadom raglay*). In the Psalms literature, this creator is usually described as having a universal dimension (Ps 8, 19, 29, 104, 148), but his throneship is also connected with the physical temple (Ps 24, 65).¹ For example, Ps 99:1-5 describes YHWH as one who is enthroned between the Cherubim on the divine mountain Zion and his people must bow down at his footstool (c.f. Ps 132:7). Ps 11:4 synthesizes these two perspectives: YHWH is in the temple while his throne is in heaven (c.f. 2:4; 47:8; 93:1-2; 123:1). So, this is linked with the perspective to see the temple as the microcosm of the garden of Eden where YHWH as the king rules over Israel and the whole universe.² The text here should be regarded as the collective memory of YHWH the creator.

The following v. 1ba-bb contains the rhetorical question “What is the house that you would build for me and what is the place of my rest?” It implies that the temple building is still ongoing in the late sixth century. Isa 64:10-11 implies that Jerusalem was still devastated and the temple was not yet restored. Here YHWH questions the builder who is “you.” Instead, following v. 2aa reveals that the true builder is YHWH himself who created “all these things” including “you.” Related to the creation of a new heaven and earth in 65:17-25 and 66:22, YHWH is introduced as the leading subject responsible for the temple reconstruction. Here the prophet

¹ The descriptions of God the creator in Job chs. 38-41 is described in the cosmic and nature level. Lady Wisdom in Prov. 8:22-31 is also in cooperating with divine creation of the universe.

² c.f. Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (New York: HarperCollins, 1985); Gregory. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2004).

Isaiah not only talks about the eschatological abstract form of a new creation but also admits the necessity of rebuilding the physical temple within the circumstances of the Persian Yehud in the late sixth century B.C.E.³ The problem is which group is responsible for doing it with the hybridization of the Yahwistic vision and Persian support. It is very important in the complex socio-political context at that time. The oracle formula (*neum yhwh*) in v.2ab closes the first prophetic messenger speech in v.1ab-2aa.

66:2b It is the announcement of restoration for those who are humble (*'ani*), contrite in spirit (*wenekeh-ruach*), and who tremble at the divine words (*wechared 'al-debriy*). In the case of Isa 61:1, *'ani* is linked with the returnees as the target of restoration and liberation within the speaker's monologue. However, here in 66:2b, *'ani* refers to a pious group who hears the divine words with a sense of awe. This group, which is introduced as divine servants (*abadim*) in Isa 65:13-16, is introduced as the main audience of the prophetic messenger speech of Trito-Isaiah's epilogue. They are also referred to as *haredim* in 66:5 and those who love Jerusalem in 66:10.

66:3-4 v.3b-4aa is the announcement of judgment against the wicked. It encompasses v.3a and 4ab-b. These verses provide the basis of the prophetic announcement of judgment. First of all, v. 3a describes in four groups the false ritual by the wicked.

³ As Keun-Jo Ahn argues, following Beuken's perspective that the Temple does not be rejected by Trito-Isaiah, he criticizes Hanson's sociological suggestion of anti-Temple visionary group. Throughout his rhetorical and canonical reading of ch. 66, Ahn proposes that the text highlights the divine presence and his ruling for those Jewish returnees who suffers theological crisis in the historical reality by highlighting the role of the spiritual Temple. Even though he hesitates to decide the dating of Trito-Isaiah, his emphasis of the spiritual Temple seems to put Trito-Isaiah in the context of the Temple reconstruction. Keun-Jo Ahn, "이사야 66 장에 나타난 성전(聖殿)논쟁 연구 [A Reconsideration of the Temple Controversy in Isaiah 66:1-24]" *KJOTS* 19.3 (2013), 298-9; 315-7. See also, Wim Beuken, "Does Trito-Isaiah Reject the Temple?: An Intertextual Inquiry into Isa. 66:1-6" in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in honor of Bas Van Israel*. ed. Spike Draisma (Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok, 1989), 53-66.

Table 7. The Four Groups of the Wicked in 66:3a

	A	B
1	one who slaughters an ox (<i>shochet hachor</i>)	one who kills man (<i>makeh- 'ish</i>)
2	one who slaughters an ox (<i>shochet hachor</i>)	one who breaks a dog's neck (<i>'orep kaleb</i>)
3	one who presents <i>mincha</i> (<i>ma'aleh mincha</i>)	(one who offers) the blood of pig (<i>dam-hazir</i>)
4	one who makes a memorial offering of frankincense (<i>mazkir lebonah</i>)	one who blesses <i>'awen</i> (<i>mebarek 'awen</i>)

Except the third case of pig's blood (*dam chazir*), all cases are composed as nominal phrases of the participle. The problem is how two different nominal phrases correspond to each other. Jack M. Sasson reads "A is B," but Blenkinsopp and Sweeney read "A and also B."⁴ Both cases aim for natural reading in English translation. Within the Hebrew poetic structure, we see that two pairs of nominal phrases are parallel without the use of a conjunction. So, as it is, it is reasonable and artistic to read "A, B." Contents of the A group are primarily connected with traditional sacrifices. Although the vocabulary of sacrificial animals here—like the ox (*shor*) and sheep (*seh*)—are different from what Leviticus refers to as ox (*baqar*) and lamb (*keseb*), it could be said that both are semantically related. Unlike the case of the A group, the contents of the B group have more negative nuances.

First of all, it is necessary to see the hiphil masculine singular participle "one who kills man (*makeh- 'ish*)" in the first of the B group. Similar usage is found in Exo 21:12 for describing the law against deliberate murder. This is linked with how one leads another to death by beating (*makeh*). In the case of Exo 2:11, an Egyptian beats (*makeh*) a Hebrew slave. Therefore, the

⁴ Jack M. Sasson, "Isaiah LXVI 3-4a" *VT* 26.2 (1976), 199-207. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah* 56-66, 297. Sweeney, *Isaiah* 40-66, 362, 372-3.

nominal phrase *makeh-’ish* should be regarded as one who puts another to death in the outcome of reckless fatal violence. Such crimes entail intentionality (Num 35:31). If we consider the parallel phrase of “one who slaughters an ox (*shochet hachor*)” in A group, we can presume who *makeh-’ish* is. In the ancient Israelite religious tradition, the ox has the highest rank among sacrificial animals. In case of the *hattat* offering, it is offered by priests and elders of the congregation. So, here the target of criticism is religious leaders like existing religious and political leaders in late sixth century Yehud (c.f. 59:1-8). Unlike the normal rites for sacrificing the ox (*olah*, Lev 1:3-9; *shelamim*, 3:1-5; *hattat*, 4:3-21), it may become amateuristic and violent. As Blenkinsopp presumes, it would link the context of child sacrifice with what is implied in the expression *shochatey hayeladim* (one who slaughters your children) in 57:5.⁵ In the Akedah text, the verb *shachat* is used to describe the action of trying to sacrifice Isaac (Gen 22:10). Furthermore, the use of the verb *shachat* also implies the reality of corrupted leadership. Isa 22:13 uses this verb to criticize those in the valley of vision (Jerusalem) who enjoy a hedonistic banquet full of food and drinks with no worries of the anxious future.

Second, “one who breaks a dog's neck (*’orep kaleb*)” is parallel with “one who sacrifices a lamb (*zobeach haseh*).” An untainted lamb is offered by normal common people (*olah*, Lev 1:10-13; *shelamim*, 3:6-16; *hattat*, 4:32-35; *asham*, 5:14-6:7). Now the text targets the normal middle class in the community. “Breaking the neck (*’orep*)” may also imply a kind of ritual performance. If one cannot afford to redeem the firstborn of a donkey with a lamb, the owner should break the donkey’s neck (Exo 13:13; 34:20). If one case of murder is still unsolved, the

⁵ Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66*, 297.

local community leaders nearby the case will bring the heifer with no yoke into the valley where water flows and will break her neck in front of the priests. Then they wash their hands over the dead body to show their innocence (Deut 21:4, 6). So, this is related to ransom rituals. However, in the case of the term dog (*keleb*), unlike lamb, the command holds primarily negative connotations. For example, unclean foods are regarded as the things to throw to dogs (Exo 22:31; c.f. Prov 26:11). When Mephibosheth ben Jonathan, who was the last prince of the house of Saul, met King David, he called himself a dead dog (2Sam 9:8; c.f. 2Sam 3:8; 16:9; Job 30:1). Deut 23:17-18 also denounces male prostitutes as dogs. The negative nuance of dogs is continued in Trito-Isaiah. In 56:10-11, he criticizes the leaders as “silent dogs” who cannot bark but love to lie down and slumber. In this respect, the expression of breaking a dog's neck would be regarded as a criticism leveled against those who do not distinguish between what is clean and not clean (64:6) because of their syncretistic tendency (65:2-7, 11-12).

Third, “one who presents *mincha* (*ma’aleh mincha*)” is parallel with “(one who offers) the blood of pig (*dam-hazir*).” In the case of the independent *mincha* offering, it includes oil and frankincense (*lebonah*) (Lev 2:1-2, 15; 6:15). If it depends on *olah* or *hattat*, oil and frankincense are not added (5:11). This case is for the poor who cannot afford to offer any kind of sacrificial animals, even small doves. The *mincha* for denouncing the spouse’s cheating also prohibits adding oil and frankincense. It is called the offering of jealousy (*minchat qena’ot*) or the offering of remembrance (*minchat zikaron*) (Num 5:15, 26). Since *mincha* does not entail the sacrifice of living animals, it does not have any rites of sprinkling, spilling, and smearing blood to redeem the community's uncleanness by purifying the liturgical space. Drinking blood is prohibited

because blood is identified with life itself (Lev 17:11, 14; Deut 12:23). However, pigs are not included in the list of sacrificial animals, instead, they are considered unclean (Lev 11:7; Deut 14:8). Unfortunately, during the time of Trito-Isaiah, eating pigs occurred very openly in the community among syncretists (65:4, 66:17). This shows that *kosher* law was not strictly observed within the community in Yehud and explains why Haggai taught purification laws on food and corpses to priests (Hag 2:10-14). It is hard to reconstruct how the pig's blood is used liturgically. It is possible to presume in the context of *nesek* (drink offering) from verses where *mincha* is parallel with *nesek*, but *nesek* is mostly related to the ritual of pouring the wine,⁶ rather than being connected with the liturgical commands like pouring sacrifice blood out on the altar (*olah*, Deut 12:27) or at the base of the altar (*hattat*, Lev 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34). In sum, it implies the agricultural circumstances that offer unclean animals for sacrificial liturgies, which is not allowed by religious law.

Fourth, “one who makes a memorial offering of frankincense (*mazkir lebonah*)” is parallel with “one who blesses ‘*awen* (*mebarek ‘awen*).” The frankincense is linked with *mincha*. However, as we discussed above, offering frankincense is prohibited in the offering of remembrance (*minchat zikaron*) in Num 5:15. The term ‘*awen* means trouble, misfortune, and iniquity, in some cases it means idol (1Sam 15:23). Hosea denounces Beth-El as Beth-Awen because of the iniquity and idolatry of eighth century Northern Israel (Hos 4:15; 5:8, 10:5, 8). In sum, the term ‘*awen* refers to non-Yahwistic liturgical performances by syncretists.

⁶ Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66*, 298.

To conclude, “they,” which are impious and wicked syncretists, choose their own ways (v.3b) while YHWH will make his own decision to judge them (v.4aa). V. 4ab-b provides an additional reason for divine judgment against the wicked. The reason is they do not hear or answer YHWH’s calls, which refers to the violation of the call for *Shema* in Deut 6:4-5 and the continuation of blindness and deafness in Isa 6:9-10. Even though Deutero-Isaiah promises liberation from being blind and deaf (Isa 41:20), still some people choose what YHWH does not like for their delight during the late sixth century B.C.E. So, those people are connected with idol worshippers in 57:3ff and rebellious people in 65:2ff,

66:5 The prophetic speaker calls the pious YHWH tremblers (*haredim*) again in v.5a. However, the following word in v.5b is not from the prophet, but from YHWH delivered by the mouth of the prophet. The expression “my name (*shemi*)” in v.5ba reveals that the subject of this speech is YHWH himself. The wicked had a sibling relationship (‘*acheykem*) with the pious, but they excommunicated the pious from the community with hatred because they called on YHWH’s name. According to the quotation of the wicked’s speech in v.5bb, it reveals how they are mocking another by using the language of blessing: “let YHWH be glorified, that we may see your joy.” The basis of this mockery is the unstable identity of the pious group because they have distanced themselves from the mainstream of Israel by using the expression “though Abraham does not know us and Israel does not acknowledge us” in 63:16 (Interestingly, this minoritized group calls itself “the holy people (‘*am-qadesheka*)” in 63:18).⁷ Nevertheless YHWH clearly

⁷ Yoon-Kyung Lee’ argues that the description of *haredim* in Isa 66:5 is very different with *haredim* of Ezra 9:4 and 10:3. While Blenkinsopp views both of them as homogenous group that its social locations is shifted from the periphery to the core, she focuses on the internal split of the *haredim* into two different group even though both identifies themselves under the same title “*haredim*.” In this respect, both (coming from returning community)

expresses his announcement of judgment against the wicked who are mocking them in the imperfect future tense in v.5bc.

66:6 Temporarily the speaker is changed from YHWH to the prophetic speaker who takes the role of the narrator. This verse is composed as only a nominal phrase without any temporal sense. Following the imperfect future tense in v.5bc, the speaker tries to describe which sounds will be heard in the near future on the day of judgment against the wicked. V. 6a mentions the city and the *heykal* without any specification. Particularly, the term *heykal* does not contain typical modifiers like *yhwh* or *kadosh* (holy), so it is hard to figure out which *heykal*. However, here the city and the *heykal* are considered as the place for the wicked who persecute and excommunicate their brothers who follow YHWH sincerely. Moreover, the speaker calls them the enemies (*‘oyebyw*) of YHWH. If they are related to those adversaries who have trampled down the divine sanctuary (*tzareynu bossu miqdasheka*) where the pious people took hold for a little while (63:18-19), the text here is related to YHWH’s future ministry for purifying the sacred space. Following the announcement of restoration, which is centered around the pious group, the passage supports and develops this idea.

7.1.2. 66:7-18aa New Birth of People by Zion

66:7 Description of *Bat Zion*’s birth of a son before in labor

66:8a Rhetorical questions that call those who can testify how a nation appears in a moment.

66:8b Answer: *Bat Zion* has sons as soon as in labor

66:9a-ba Rhetorical questions that affirm YHWH’s work

agrees and supports the Second Temple (whether it is on progress or completed) under the recognition of the imperial administration, but *haredim* is split into two (one is of Trito-Isaiah, other is of Ezra) concerning the issues of the inclusion of foreigners into Jerusalem liturgy. Yoon-Kyung Lee, “이 사야 66 장의 하레딤 연구 [A Study on Haredim in Isaiah 66]” *KJOTS* 27.1 (2021), 222-3; 227-37.

66:9bb Closing divine speech formula (*amar elohayik*)

66:10a Call to rejoice to those who love Jerusalem

66:10b Call to rejoice to those who mourn over Jerusalem

66:11 Result: you will nurse and be satisfied from her consoling and glorious breast.

66:12aa Prophetic speech formula (*ki ko amar yhwh*)

66:12ab Announcement of restoration 1: I will extend peace and glory like a river and stream.

66:12b Announcement of restoration 2: you will nurse, be carried upon her side, and played with upon her knees.

66:13a Source: like (*ki*) one whom his mother comforts

66:13b Target: I will comfort you, you will be comforted in Jerusalem.

66:14a Result: you will see, your hearts rejoice, and your bones flourish like grass.

66:14ba Prophet's closing remarks 1: divine hand (*yad*) will be known to his servants (*'abadayw*)

66:14bb Prophet's closing remarks 2 divine indignation (*za'am*) against his enemies (*'oyebayw*)

66:15a Description of divine theophany with divine anger and rebuke

66:16 Effect: many will be slain by the divine fire and sword.

66:17a-ba Announcement of Judgement against those who do syncretistic worship.

66:17bb closing oracle formula (*neum yhwh*)

66:18aa additional note: YHWH know their works and thoughts

66:7–9 The words are turned back to prophetic messenger speech. The closing formula (*amar elohayik*) in 9bb provides a marker of this. Verses 7-9 describe the new birth of new sons by Daughter/Mother Zion. While v.7 describes *Bat Zion* as one who delivers her son before she feels labor pains, *Bat Zion* in v.8b delivers many sons right after her labor. Even though there are subtle differences technically, definitely both describe the same circumstances within the rhetorical framework of restoration. The verses following verses 10-14 will discuss who those newborn sons are. If we keep in mind rhetorical questions in v.8a and 9a-ba, *Bat Zion's* delivery

would be considered as the metaphoric device to explain how one nation and one land appears in a moment by YHWH's action. The first rhetorical question in 8a is about how a nation appears in a moment. It contains an irony that there is no one to hear and see what happened because it happened in a moment. The second rhetorical question in 9a-ba highlights the divine role to bring forth a child, not shut the womb. Definitely, this is for stressing the message of restoration. However, other biblical texts describe YHWH's responsibility for bringing forth a child (Isa 51:2; c.f. Gen 29:31; 30:22) and shutting the womb (Gen 20:18).

66:10-14a Prophetic messenger speech continues (c.f. v. 12aa, *ki ko amar yhwh*). He calls all those who love and mourn over Jerusalem in v.10. Eventually, they will rejoice and be glad for her on the day of restoration. In 65:18-19, YHWH proclaims that he creates Jerusalem "to be a joy" and her people "to be a gladness," so that "no more shall be heard in it the sound of weeping and the cry of distress." This is not just a technical reversion into the past based on simple nostalgia, but it is the proclamation of a renewed tradition within hybridized space. Therefore, here the description of Jerusalem is very different from the one in chs. 60-62.

The metaphor of Daughter/Mother Zion in v. 7-9 continues in v.11-13. V. 11 describes the people as "you all" who will nurse and be satisfied from *Bat Zion*'s consoling breast. It is the image of carrying a child upon her waist and playing with a child upon her knees in v. 12b. In v.13, like a mother consoles her child, the relationship between YHWH and "you all" is described: when YHWH consoles them, they will be comforted in Jerusalem. Therefore we realize that the sons of *Bat Zion* in v. 7-9 are those who love and mourn over Jerusalem in v.10. The developed image in v.11-13 shows how a child ~~is~~ has grown up under the mother's love and

care. This image is very different from how *Bat Zion* is ambivalently described between the parent-children and the husband-wife in 62:5. Along with a mother-child metaphor in v.12b-13, it is necessary to mention other metaphoric features in the announcement of restoration in v. 12-14a. Using the image of an overflowing river and stream in v. 12, it shows that YHWH will extend his peace and glory. In fact, the abundance of water is the major image used to describe restoration in the prophetic and psalmic literature (Isa 41:18; 43:19-20; Ezk 31:4; 47:1; Ps 78:16; 147:18).

V. 14a explains what will result as the response to the announcement of restoration. Here the theme of rejoicing is similar to v. 10. This rejoicing as the result of restoration would be the embodied experience for the audience by identifying strong bones with flourishing grass (*dash'a*). Sometimes the term *dash'a* is linked to a negative nuance (Isa 15:6; 37:27), here it is used positively. The similar term *hatziyr* is linked with the mortality of human beings (Isa 37:27; 40:6-8; Ps 90:6).

66.14b These are the closing remarks by a prophetic speaker to that precede the following theophany in v.15-18aa. The divine hand in 14ba is described as the delivering hand for his servants (*'abadayw*), who are the ones who hear his words with a sense of owing (*haredim*). This hand is already introduced as the hand of creation of all things in v.2aa. Conversely, v.14bb describes his indignation (*za'am*) with which he will face for his enemies (*'oyebayw*), who are mentioned in v.6b, who have been excommunicated from the pious group.

66:15-18aa These verses are the description of theophany, delivered by YHWH through the prophetic mouth (c.f. 17bb, *neum yhw*). However, here YHWH does not refer to himself in

the first person, but in the third person. The judgment against the wicked is more specifically described. V. 15 highlights YHWH the warrior who rides the chariot of fire to express his anger and rebuke (c.f. Exo 15; Hab 3). In the following v. 16, YHWH judges all flesh (*kol-basar*) by his fire and sword. Here the speaker said many will be killed. The term *kol-basar* is used when accusing all of corruption and proclaiming universal judgment during the time of Noah (Gen 6:12-13, 17, 19; 7:16, 21, 8:17; 9:11, 15-16). The term “sword of YHWH” is also mentioned in the context of universal judgment (Isa 34:1-7). 2Chr 21:12 links it with the pandemic but here it highlights the war image. In terms of theophany, it is a reminder of the revenge against Edom from the perspective of returnees in 63:1-6, but here the divine rage is aimed not just at outsiders but also insiders.

According to v.17a-ba, the target of judgment is those who follow YHWH with syncretic practices. They are referred to as “those who sanctify and purify themselves (*hamitqaddeshim wehamtitaharim*).” From this expression, it is presumed that they are making an effort to fulfill ritual holiness and purification to some degree. In this vein, they argue “keep to yourself, do not come near me, for I am too holy for you” from the quotation in 65:5. So it is possible to presume that their socio-political and even religious rank is higher than others in mid-sixth century Persian Yehud.

However, the following prepositional phrase “into the gardens (*el-haganot*)” is very antinomic in accordance with Yahwistic tradition. The first chapter of the Book of Isaiah already mentions *haganot* as rebels and sinners who worship one whom they have chosen while they forsake YHWH (Isa 1:29). In 65:3, syncretists, who are called “rebellious people,” are described

as those who offer sacrifices over *haganot* and make offerings on bricks. Therefore, we can presume that *haganot* is linked with negative connotations. As the prophetic speaker utters harsh criticism with divine authority, syncretists are eating pigs (Lev 11:7), abominable things (Lev 11:11, 13, 43; 20:25; Deut 7:26) and mice (Lev 11:29), which the food law prohibits because of their unclean status, following a performer in the midst of gardens. This is a continuation of the criticism against the one who offers) the blood of a pig (*dam-hazir*) in v.3a. According to Lev 20:25, the people of Israel are required to separate the clean and the unclean as a way of keeping their bodies free from the detestable foods (*sheqetz*) in terms of their being holy unto YHWH.

From the form-critical perspective, v.17bb is considered to be a clear closing remark because of the use of the oracle formula (*neum yhw*). However, it is necessary to reconsider the contents in v.18aa as the conclusion of part B, verses 7 to 18aa. First of all, the phrase “their works (*ma’asehem*)” has negative connotations in relation to sinful idolatry in Isa 29:15; 41:29; and 59:6. Also, “their thoughts (*machsheboteyhem*)” is found in 65:2 when the rebellious people follow their way of thinking that is not good and right. Surely there is no verb between the subject *we’anoki* and the following two objects, but it is possible to presume that the first person subject “knows” those works and thoughts. Consequently, it is reasonable to view v.18aa as the conclusion of the previous theophany scene of verses 15 to 17.⁸

⁸ JPS TANAKH also does. Berlin and Brettler, eds., *The Jewish Study Bible*, 915.

7.1.3. 66:18ab-21 Announcement of Restoration and Following Divine Actions

66:18ab Announcement of restoration 1: Time is coming to gather all nations and tongues (*kol-hagoyim wehaleshonot*)

66:18b Announcement of restoration 2: They will come and see my glory (*kabodi*)

66:19aa Divine action 1: I will set a sign (‘*ot*) among them (*kol-hagoyim wehaleshonot*).

66:19ab Divine action 2: I will send survivors/fugitives (*peleytim*) to the nations (*hagoyim*)

66:19ba Detailed lists of the nations (*hagoyim*) above: to Tarshish, Pul, Lud, Tubal, Javan, and the coastlands (*ha'iyim harehoqim*) far away, that have not heard of me and seen my glory (*kabodi*)

66:19bb Effect 1: they (*peleytim*) will declare my glory (*kabodi*) among the nations (*hagoyim*)

66:20aa Effect 2/Target (*Simile*): they (*peleytim*) will bring all your brothers (*kol-'acheykem*) from all the nations (*kol-hagoyim*) as an offering (*mincha*) to the holy mountain (*har qadesh*) Jerusalem

66:20ab divine speech formula (*amar yhwh*)

66:20b Source (*Simile*): like (*ki*) Israelites bring the offering (*mincha*) in a clean vessel to the house of YHWH (*beit yhwh*).

66:21a Effect 3: I will take for priests and Levites from them (*kol-'acheykem*)

66:21b divine speech formula (*amar yhwh*)

Part C (vv.18ab-21) begins with the announcement of restoration and follows with divine actions and additional explanations. Depending on the closing divine speech formula (*amar yhwh*) in 20ab and 21b, the speech would be divided into two parts: the first part (vv.18-20ab) and the second part (vv.20b-21b). However, these two speeches are closely related in terms of content and structure. These two speeches are linked together by using the particle *ki* in 20b to analogy v. 20aa (*simile*). All speeches are delivered by YHWH through the mouth of the prophet.

66.18 v.18ab begins with a feminine singular participial phrase *ba'ah* without subject. If we consider that the Hebrew term *'et*, which means time, is a feminine noun, it is reasonable to read “(time) is coming...” Therefore, this time of restoration is the time of gathering all nations and tongues (*kol-hagoyim wehaleshonot*). First, the term all nations (*kol-hagoyim*) is used for referring to non-Israelites in the Book of Isaiah (2:2; 14:26; 25:7; 29:7-8; 34:2; 40:17; 43:9; 52:10; 61:11; 66:11, 18, 20). Jer 9:26 describes that *kol-hagoyim* as those who have not been circumcised in the body while the people of Israel do not practice circumcision in their minds (Jer 4:4; c.f. Deut 10:16; 30:6; Ezek 44:7, 9). During the late period of the Judean monarchy, the term *kol-hagoyim* implies that the nations were subjugated by the Neo-Babylonian Empire (Jer 25:9-14; 27:7; 28:11, 14; c.f. Hab 2:5, 7). So, Jeremiah describes *kol-hagoyim* as the place to which Jehoiachin and his nobles were deported (Jer 29:14, 18; 43:5; c.f. Zech 7:14). In the case of Jer 30:11, its characteristic wording *kol-hagoyim* is made more clear by adding the expression “among whom I scattered you” (c.f. Jer 36:2; 46:28; Obad 1:15-16). Surely, as we see in Joel 3:2 (MT 4:2) and Amos 9:9, gathering all nations is related to the divine judgment against Israel by using them as the tool (c.f. Isa 10:5, Assyria as YHWH’s staff and rod).

However, the use of *kol-hagoyim* here is different from what it was in the early sixth century. Unlike its usage with a negative sense of judgment, it can be more correctly envisioned within the framework of universal restoration and eschatological pilgrimage into Jerusalem. Moreover, the text here refers not only to all nations (*kol-hagoyim*) but also to all tongues (*wehaleshonot*) by using the conjunction (c.f. Gen 10:5, 20, 31; Deut 28:49; Ezek 3:5-6). Zech 8:23 also uses a similar expression: “from the nations of every tongue (*mikol leshonot*

hagoyim),” This expression implies the ethnic and linguistic diversity of those whom YHWH will gather into Jerusalem in the near future. Further, these various groups of people will be gathered to come and see divine glory (*kabodi*) in Jerusalem v.18bb (c.f. Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1-2). For example, in the context of the liberation of the Babylonian exiles, Isa 43:7 mentions that YHWH will bring “everyone who is called by my name, whom I created for my glory, whom I formed and made.” Isa 42:8 and 48:11 also highlights the fact that YHWH will not give his glory and praise to those who dishonor his name while worshiping others. Therefore, the act of “come and see” implies not just simple pilgrimage to physical space, but also accompanies testimonial compassion to Yahwistic faith (c.f. Isa 55:1-2; Ps 22:27-31; Ps 66:1-7). Even though Isa 60:5, 9 implies that the pilgrimage image that envisions all nations visiting Jerusalem and paying tributes, foreigners in the following chs. 61-62 are described as servants for the people of Israel and even continuing to be their enemies. It clearly shows that nationalistic idealism is what the returning people share. Unlike that, the speaker here develops his inclusive ideas not only in regard to non-returnees but also regarding non-Israelites being in the priestly ministry in 66:20-21.

66.19a v.19a is about the divine actions of his future restoration. First, YHWH will set a sign (‘*ot*) between him and all nations and tongues (*kol-hagoyim wehaleshonot*) (v.19aa). In the Book of Isaiah, the term ‘*ot* is very important *leitwort* to have a performative prophetic implication concerning a divine oracle. For example, Isaiah ben Amoz delivered the sign of Immanuel to King Ahaz who did not want to seek any divine sign (Isa 7:11-12, 14; c.f. 8:8, 10). After he sealed his prophecy in front of his disciples, Isaiah proclaimed that he and his children

(Shearjashub, 7:3; Maher-shalal-hash-baz, 8:3) will be living signs (8:18). When Sargon II collapses Ashdod in 713-711, Isaiah performs a performative prophecy as a future sign against Egypt and Cush by living himself as naked and barefoot (20:2-3).⁹ In contrast with Ahaz's disobedience, Hezekiah shows him seeking and accepting a divine sign, but the plot is different depending on the version of the story (compare 38:7 and 22). However, there are false signs which are delivered by non-Yahwistic ways such as "signs of diviner (*'otot badim*)" in Isa 44:25. The *'ot* here in v.19aa should be regarded as the criticism against those kinds of non-Yahwistic syncretism while it is standing upon the continuation of the Proto-Isaian performative tradition of divine sign.

The contents of the sign (*'ot*) among all nations and tongues (*kol-hagoyim wehaleshonot*) are explained in detail in the following v.19ab, that is to send survivors/fugitives (*peleytim*) into the nations (*hagoyim*). First of all, it is necessary to review what *peleytim* means. In the context of the fall of Samaria (Amos 9:1) and Jerusalem (Jer 42:17; 44:14; Ezek 24:26-27; 33:21-22; Lam 2:2), this term has a meaning of "fugitives" from impending judgment. In Isa 1:9, this term has a meaning of "survivors" who remained while YHWH judges and punishes his disobedient people and city. So the expression of survivors of the house of Jacob (*peleytat beyt-ya'aqob*) is parallel with the remnant of Israel (*sh'ar yisra'el*) (c.f. 37:32). However, the term used here in v.19ab is more closely related to "survivors of nations (*peley hagoyim*)" in 45:20 while it highlights the salvation of all the ends of the earth in 45:22. In other words, *peleytim* in v.19ab should be understood as those faithful among those who have various ethnic and linguistic

⁹ It implies the invasion of Thebe by Esarhaddon in 663 B.C.E.

backgrounds as v.18bb. Therefore the term *peleytim* refers to the pious group who hear divine words with a sense of owing (66:2, 5, 10). If we take this idea, it is hard to limit members of the returning community to those who share established political and religious heritage within a certain ethnicity and social class.

Then, following v.19ba is the detailed list of the nations (*hagoyim*) where *peleytim* are dispatched: Tarshish, Pul, Lud, Tubal, Javan, and the coastlands (*ha'iyim harehoqim*) far away, that have not heard of me and seen my glory (*kabodi*). Most of the names are linked with ancient cities which were located near the Mediterranean sea coasts. These are mentioned in the list of nations and languages in Gen 10 (c.f. 1 Chr 1) and trade lists of Tyre, Phoenicia in Ezek. 27. First of all, Tarshish was far from the east coast of the Mediterranean sea but was known for its wealth (Ezek 27:12, 25). It is regarded as Cádiz (Spain), ancient Carthago (Tunisia), or Sardinia (Italy). Pul (Put) is related to Libya (west part of Egypt) or Puntland (northeastern part of Somalia). Pul and Lud (which is known as archery) are both mentioned with Persians as the mercenary for Phoenicia (Ezek 27:10) and Lydia (Ezek 38:5). In Jer 46:9 and Ezek 30:5, they are also described as reinforcements for Egyptians with Cushites. Lud and Tubal are both related to Lydia in the western part of Anatolia (Turkey) (Ezek 27:13, 19). According to Ezek 38-39 mentions the King of Tubal as Gog. This is rooted in the collective memory around King Gyges of Lydia during the early seventh century B.C.E.¹⁰ Javan is linked with Ionia, the western coast of Anatolia (the east coast of Aegean sea). According to Ezek 27:13, Javan, Tubal, and Meshech had a slave trade with Tyre. The coastlands far away (*ha'iyim harehoqim*) means the place at a

¹⁰ c.f. Cogan, Mordechai., and Hayim Tadmor “Gyges and Ashurbanipal: A Study in Literary Transmission” *Orientalia* 46 (1977): 65-85.

long distance that you cannot specify. In Jer 31:10, nations (*goyim*) hear and then declare divine messages of restoration for Israel over the coastland far away. The coastlands (*ha'iyim*) are also mentioned in Ezek 26:15, 18; 27:35; and 39:6. According to Deutero-Isaiah, the term coastlands is parallel with “the end of the earth” in 41:5 and “peoples from afar” in 49:1 (c.f. 42:4, 10, 12, 15; 51:5). Another text from Trito-Isaiah, this term is used with the term described as the subject of revenge (59:18) or of tribute (60:9). In the case of the text here, it emphasizes that these lands never have any chance to hear and see divine glory (*kabodi*). In this vein, this explains why *kol-hagoyim wehaleshonot* is summoned to come and see YHWH’s glory (*kabodi*) in v. 18bb.

Consequently, the names listed above are non-Israelites nations (*hagoyim*) who do know of YHWH very well. Most cases are located in non-Mesopotamian regions, but it is related to much of the Mediterranean seacoast. The reason this is true is that the axis of power had gradually shifted from Mesopotamia to the Mediterranean Sea because of the tension between the Persian empire and the Athenian empire. However, it is not necessary to confine them as geographical names to focus on diasporic Israelites who were not from Mesopotamian regions.¹¹ Since YHWH summoned various nations and languages in v. 18bb and identified some of them as *peleytim* in v.19ab, the *hagoyim* in v.19ba also includes not only diaspora Israelites but also those who have various ethnic and linguistic backgrounds.

66:19bb-21b v.19bb-21b describes the ministry of *peleytim* in an imperfect future tense since they are dispatched into the *hagoyim* listed above. In other words, it describes how the pious group does its mission to deliver their Yahwistic faith in the Mediterranean Sea coastal

¹¹ Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66*, 314; Schramm, *The Opponents*, 181-2.

regions. Although there are closing markers like the divine speech formula (*amar yhwh*) found in v. 20ab and 21b, these do not distract from the flow of reading. The ministry of *peleytim* is divided into three parts. The first, *peleytim* will proclaim divine glory (*kabodi*) among the *hagoyim* listed above. Particularly, this is related to the nations that never have any chance to hear and see YHWH's glory like the case of "the coastlands far away (*ha'iyim harehoqim*)."

(c.f. v.18bb, 19ba)

The second, *peleytim* will bring all their brothers (*kol-'acheykem*) among all the nations (*kol-hagoyim*) to Jerusalem. Here in this missional performance of pilgrimage, the *kol-'acheykem* are likened with *mincha* to the YHWH (v. 20aa). They will go on a pilgrimage into Jerusalem where the divine mountain (*har qadesh*) is located by using various means of transportation (horse, chariots, litters, mules, or dromedaries). Interestingly, YHWH makes parallel eschatological pilgrimage scenes with the traditional imagery of ancient Israelite *mincha* liturgy by using particle *ki* in v.20b even though the divine speech formula (*amar yhwh*) breaks the sentence in v. 20ab. This scene is of Israelites bringing their *mincha* in clean vessels into the house of YHWH (*beit yhwh*). This reminds us of polemics against those who wrongly offer *mincha* like the pig's blood in v. 3. If we are concerned about this criticism against syncretists above, it is no accident of "*mincha* in clean vessels" in the scene of this universal pilgrimage from all nations. In other words, here YHWH calls and invites those pious people who follow his words sincerely whether or not of certain ethnicity and class. Even though the temple building is still under construction, it does not deprive Jerusalem of legitimacy as the holy mountain where all people worship YHWH.

In this vein, finally, the *peleytim*'s ministry for bringing their brothers into the holy mountains is further considered as liturgical performance in v.21a. YHWH proclaims that he will choose priests (*kohanim*) and Levites from among "them." Unlike most commentators, he identifies *mehem* with foreign gentiles, Rofé, Schramm, Sweeney, and Nihan provide different answers. Depending on the passive role of gentiles in chs. 60-62, following Rofé's argument, Schramm believes that the image of gentiles should be consistent with 66:18-24. So, he contends that *mehem* in v.21a should be linked with the diaspora Israelites in 66:21 to say that "the monopoly of the Jerusalem priests will thus be broken."¹² Sweeney also tries to read *mehem* in v.21a in the syntactical context of *ki*-simile between source (v.20b) and target (v.20aa).

Although many interpreters read "and I will also take from them" in v. 21a as a reference to the nations, the antecedent to this phrase is "and the sons of Israel shall bring an offering in vessels of pure gold to the house of YHWH" - i.e., it refers the fugitives returned by the nations. The YHWH speech formula in v.21b closes the presentation of YHWH's second speech.¹³

So, *mehem* in v.21a is linked with *peleytim* who are linked to the Israelites (*bnei Israel*). The problem is how we identify who *peleytim* is in Trito-Isaiah's scenario in ch. 66. Christophe Nihan confines the identity of the pious group and *peleytim* in chs. 65-66 to the Jewish diaspora. If we follow this logic, only those in the Jewish diaspora can serve in the priesthood mentioned in v.21a while Trito-Isaiah clearly holds the ethnic distinction between Judeans and non-Judeans

¹² Alexander Rofé, "Isaiah 66:1-4: Judaeans Sects in the Persian Period as Viewed by Trito-Isaiah," in *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry*, ed. Ann Kort and Scott Morschauser (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 212; Schramm, *The Opponents*, 172.

¹³ Sweeney, *Isaiah 40-66*, 375-76.

as he shows in chs. 60-62.¹⁴ First of all, as most commentators agree, Nihan tries to find logical coherence between the core and the bookend within the final form of Trito-Isaiah. If we focus on the possible biconceptualism of one who experiences inner struggle between traditional ingroup (returnees) and newly encountered outgroup (non-returnees) from the perspective of second or third generation exiles, the exposed incoherence would be solved in different ways. As we discussed in Chapters Five and Six, Trito-Isaiah's biconceptualism is rooted in the mismatch of his internal desire and external ministry in terms of public communication depending on whether or not it is successfully delivered. Second, Nihan tries to identify the diaspora Jews within the context of early-fourth century B.C.E. Actually, his overall framework of the final composition of Trito-Isaiah is very similar to what Berges decided (see, Chapter Two). Even though Berges does not show the historical background of the Arabic invasion against Edom, Nihan mentions it could provide clues for evidencing his late dating based on some archeological artifacts (Aramaic Ostraca from Idumea) and archeological reevaluation of late Persian and early Hellenistic period.¹⁵ He dates the final form of Trito-Isaiah during the first half of fourth-century B.C.E.¹⁶ Following M. Knobel's dating of pro-Zadokite redaction of Ezek 40-48 to early-fourth century B.C.E., he views Isa 56 as being later than Ezek 44, which attests that "at some point during the Persian period the Zadokide priesthood had taken up and developed the notion, also

¹⁴ Christophe Nihan, "Ethnicity and Identity in Isaiah 56-66," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 91-92.

¹⁵ Nihan, "Ethnicity and Identity," 67-8; Bezalel Porten and Ada Yardeni, "Social, Economic, and Onomastic Issues in the Aramaic Ostraca of the Fourth Century B.C.E." in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, 457-88; Lipschits and Tal argues that there are archeological continuity from the late sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E. to the second century in terms of progression of Judahite stamped seal. Oded Lipschits and Oren Tal, "The Settlement Archaeology of the Province of Judah: A Case Study" in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, 37.

¹⁶ Nihan, "Ethnicity and Identity," 93, 96-7.

reflected in Nehemiah 13, of the inherent uncleanness of foreigners and used it to legitimate, or even consolidate, their monopoly over the Second Temple.”¹⁷ From this point of view, he read *'acheykem* in vv. 5-6 as the diaspora Jews in the connection with the Egyptian Diaspora in Elephantine.¹⁸ Unfortunately, Trito-Isaiah never mentions Egypt unlike Proto- and Deutero-Isaiah. Therefore, vv. 19bb-21b should be read with growing attention to the Mediterranean region, especially the international circumstances between Persia and Greece since the late sixth century B.C.E. Third, it is necessary to discuss Nihan’s reconstruction of the ethnic stratum. Even though he carefully deals with the complex ethnic issues by perceiving that Trito-Isaiah does not show full favor to the converted foreigners in 56:1-8 (he is focusing only on the *bene hankar* in 56.3a, 6-8), he mixed up issues of ethnicity with the liturgical classism at the end of his discussion. So, his proposal is like this: Judeans (*bene israel*) = Priests; Proselytes (*bene hankar*) = Levites; and Other righteous foreigners and eunuchs = Lay worshippers.¹⁹ This proposal is very schematic by reading 56:18 as the rereading of Ezek 44:1-16 and Num 18:1-7. However, as already discussed above, 56:1-8 does not mention the priest and Levites; shows only the converted foreigners and eunuchs’s ministry as YHWH’s servants (*abadim*). Also, at least in 56:1-8, the description of their ministry does not emphasize their priestly roles enough, but generally highlights how they maintain the covenantal relationship with YHWH. Interestingly, the mention of priests and Levites here in 66:1-24 would be considered the continuation of 56:1-8 in terms of its use of public and prophetic formula unlike the case of chs. 61-62 monologically delivered (c.f. 61:6).

¹⁷ Nihan, “Ethnicity and Identity,” 77, 81.

¹⁸ Nihan, “Ethnicity and Identity,” 68, 90-1, 4.

¹⁹ Nihan, “Ethnicity and Identity,” 94.

For these reasons, the term *peleytim* in v.19ab could not be limited to diaspora Israelites alone or even limited to those who have various ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. In the case of ch. 66, Trito-Isaiah more focus should be on the pious group that followed the divine words with a sense of awe. The identity and ministry of *peleytim* should be understood in this respect, especially within the context of v.18-21. P. A. Smith notices how ministry is differentiated in v. 19-20 and in v. 21, even though his identification of *peleytim* as foreigners alone would not be supported. He notes,

Verses 19-20 and 21 may function in parallel. Yahwah will take two groups from the nations, those who will go out as “missionaries”, whose duties are outlined in vv. 19b-20, and those who will become priests and levites (v. 21). It is also possible that the priests and the levites are taken from the “survivors” who bring back the exiled Jews from the outlying nations.²⁰

If we focus on the difference between missional and priestly ministries, it leads us to notice that this ministerial difference would be linked with the division between *peleytim* and *kol-’acheykem* within the liturgical allegory in v. 20-21. These differences have been noticed by Hae-Kwon Kim. He views the ministry of *kol-’acheykem* as one that is priestly, while the ministry of *peleytim* is missional.²¹

In the allegorical statement in v. 20, the ministry of *peleytim* is likened to the traditional liturgical performance when Israelites bring their *mincha* into the Temple: *peleytim* will bring their brothers (*kol-’acheykem*) from all nations into the holy mountain. Here the role of the subjects (Israelites, *peleytim*) in the simile is limited to the performative role of those who bring

²⁰ P. A. Smith, *Rhetoric and Redaction*, 168.

²¹ Unlike Smith, he identifies *peleytim* and *kol-’acheykem* as diaspora Jews, especially Babylonian exiles during Ezra-Nehemiah. Hae-Kwon Kim, 하나님 나라 신학으로 읽는 이사야 40-66 장 [Reading Isaiah 40-66 through the Theology of the Kingdom of God] (Seoul: Boggitneun Saram, 2020), 697-8.

liturgical offerings to the holy space. If we consider this to be liturgical imagery, it is possible to say that the objects (*mincha*, *kol-'acheykem*) would be more correctly considered as clean in the liturgical sense. If we accept this nuance, those who are chosen as priests and Levites should be linked with *kol-'acheykem*. Therefore, *mehem* in v. 21 should be linked with the object, not the subject of the simile in v. 20.

In sum, here the third person masculine personal pronoun *hem* refers more to *kol-'acheykem*, who were brought into Jerusalem as *mincha* rather than *peleytim*. So it is better to read that, regardless of ethnicity or class, YHWH chose priests and Levites from among *kol-'acheykem*, one with a Mediterranean background. This implies that, at least within the Trito-Isaian idealism, the candidacy to the priesthood is open to any who do not come out of the returning community. So, this is not like what chs. 61-62 insist on — the nationalistic community centered by the Jews returned from Babylon who inherited the political and priestly heritages from the past monarchy. Furthermore, it goes beyond focusing on inviting the converted foreigners into the Yahwistic congregation as worshippers as verse. 56:1-8 imagines. Since a series of tensions and following wars between Persia and Greece affected the Yehudites' ways of living and thinking, recognition by the Mediterranean worlds was probably very important during the late sixth century B.C.E. So, this makes the prophetic speaker here imagine the universal expansion of Yahwism going beyond the traditional region of Yehud and Mesopotamia to Mediterranean worlds.

7.1.4. 66:22-24 New Creation with Judgment

66:22aa Source (Simile): like (*ki*) the new heaven and earth will stand before me

66:22ab Oracle formula (*neum yhwh*)

66:22b Target (Simile): your seed and name will stand

66:23a Regular time: Every Chodesh, every Sabbath.

66:23ba All flesh (*kol-basar*) will worship before me

66:23bb Divine speech formula (*amar yhwh*)

66:24a Description of Judgment against the wicked 1: They (*kol-basar*) will see the corpus of the rebelled (*bepigrey h'anashim haposh'im biy*).

66:24b Description of Judgment against the wicked 2: Their (the wicked) worm will not die, their fire will not be quenched, and they will be an abhorrence to all flesh (*kol-basar*).

Verses 22-24 is the concluding part, not only for Trito-Isaiah, but also for the whole Book of Isaiah. Following the markers like the oracles formula in v. 22ab (*neum yhwh*) and divine speech formula in v. 23bb (*amar yhwh*), we can consider v.22aa as the third divine speech, v.22b-23ba as the fourth, and v.24 as the final one. Since there is no distraction in terms of the flow of reading, it is possible to view vv. 22-24 as a single unit in terms of contents. While vv. 22-23 is the announcement of restoration for the pious Yahwist, v. 24 describes the judgment against the wicked.

66:22 v. 22aa is the analogy about v. 22b. Here YHWH reminds Israelites of the new heaven and earth (*hashamayim hachodashim weha'aretz hachadasha*) at the beginning of the chapter (66:1) and 65:17 by highlighting his blessing for the pious: As his new creations will exist forever and ever, his blessing over the seed and name will be forever also. Even though the theme of new creation would be linked with the eschatological vision of Zion, it does not neglect the necessity of the temple reconstruction and the importance of Jerusalem per se. If we presume that its socio-historical background is the late sixth century in relation to the temple under

construction, it can be more clearly understood as a kind of futuristic use of the new creation metaphor. The important thing is: Who is responsible for doing that? So, “you” mentioned here should be analyzed in this context as we've discussed above. Here “you” should be those who follow the divine words with a sense of awe regardless of ethnicity and class; *haredim* (66:5), those who love Jerusalem (66:10); *peleytim* among all nations and languages (66:19; c.f. 45:20). The parallel of seeds (*zar'akem*) and names (*weshimkem*) implies how YHWH deals with these people; he does it carefully. As we know from patriarchal stories in Genesis, the theme of progeny is very important with the theme of land in terms of reliability of the divine covenant. So, prolonged infertility status is a threat against the covenantal relationship (c.f. Gen 15, 17, 18, 22). A similar image is also mentioned in the case of converted eunuchs who hold his covenant in Isa 56:5. YHWH declares that he will give them an everlasting name (*shem olam*) that is not cut off from the sons and daughters. Therefore, as the theme of land is not just limited in the physical space but also expanded throughout the vision of this new creation, it is possible to say that the theme of progeny is also expanded beyond certain ethnicity and class. In this vein, the expansion of priestly candidacy in 66:21 would be included in this category.

66:23 With this expanded worldview above, here YHWH overviews how he will be worshipped in the future. Ordinary worship like that of every Sabbath and every Chodesh is mentioned, instead of specific major festivals like Passover, Shavuot, and Sukkot. So, the order of daily and monthly life is highlighted more than the seasonal pattern of agriculture. Furthermore, the congregation of the worship is expanded to all flesh (*kol-basar*) who make a pilgrimage to worship YHWH. This is a reminder of similar usages with the theme of restoration

in the Deutero-Isaiah (Deut 40:5; 49:26). It is contradictory with what the term *kol-basar* in v. 16 indicates with its judgmental connotations. Interestingly, v. 24 continues this nuance in regard to what the term *kol-basar* in v. 16 reveals.

66:24 While YHWH shows the restored order of worship by the pious, he shows the brutal scene of eternal judgment against the wicked. It is very gruesome when we imagine the corpse with maggots swarming over it and the unquenchable fire burning it. Interestingly, those who see this gruesome scene notice that it is all about flesh (*kol-basar*) mentioned in v. 23 above. They will feel abhorrence (*dera'on*) after they see this scene of judgment against the wicked. Even though Trito-Isaiah in 56:1-8 and 66:1-24 tries to expand the boundaries of the Yahwistic congregation with an inclusive sense that depends on divine authority, here he made another clear distinction between the new ingroup and outgroup by using the language of hatred. This is nothing different from what he revealed in his monologic self-proclamation in chs. 61-62. The only difference is, in chs. 61-62, Trito-Isaiah is trying to receive more attention from his returnees, while he claims his proper leadership. For doing this, he makes a boundary between returnees and non-returnees in chs. 61-62 by denouncing the latter.

7.2. Closing Remarks

Along with 56:1-8, 66:1-24 reveals more inclusive attention to others. While 56:1-8 suggests inviting the converted foreigners into the congregations of YHWH, 66:1-24 goes further to view them as possible candidates for the priesthood of future Yahwistic worship by the pious group. Regardless of the category of the Yahwistic congregation being expanded, the importance

of Jerusalem and the temple is not diminished in Trito-Isaiah. The vision of the new creation should not be considered a rejection of the entire effort to rebuild the temple, but the question of who is responsible for doing it.

Here Trito-Isaiah's ambivalence is revealed. As we discussed in chapter five on the chs. 61-62, Trito-Isaiah shows his monologic self-awareness as the appropriate leader for the community of Yehud run by the returnees. Depending on their inherited collective memories, Trito-Isaiah wants to show off himself as the right one to lead the community instead of the existing leaders of Yehud. His criticism against the established leadership requires the approval of the supporting group per se. Even though he is using the language of returnees in chs. 61-62, it seems he never hears any approving echoes from his intended audience from the established ingroup (returnees) since it is delivered in the monologic tone. However, when he turns his attention to the marginalized outgroup (non-returnees) relying on divine authority, he gets more attention from that audience. This outgroup was socially mixed under the rule of returnees within the space of Persian Yehud during the late sixth century. Since those people were usually identified as foreign from the perspective of returnees, it is very hard to identify who they were in terms of ethnicity and class. In the case of 56:1-8, Trito-Isaiah converts foreigners and eunuchs into the covenantal community of YHWH. Going beyond this, he breaks the traditional boundaries of *kohanim* and *levi'im* and then expands it to those who are living in the Mediterranean coastal area in 66:1-24.

The problem is his attitude towards others. In chs. 61-62, following the traditional logic of nationalism, he proposes the priestly community led by returnees. While he is doing that, he

describes the foreigners (non-returnees) as servants of Israel and even rules them out of the community by calling them enemies. Even though his ambitious political language does not touch his intended audience (returnees), his prophetic word relying on divine authority is touching non-returnees who hear YHWH's word with a sense of awe. This creates a sense of irony and ambiguity when the actual reader reads the entire Trito-Isaiah in its the final form. Even though 56:1-8 and 66:1-24 provide more inclusive expectations for future worship, the final verse in the bookend (66:24) still shows the classic language of ruling out what 62:8 shows within the newly suggested framework of the ingroup (the pious) and outgroup (the wicked).

Conclusion

Trito-Isaiah is an anonymous man of transition during the unstable socio-political context of temple building in the late sixth century Persian Yehud. Even though he shows himself off as the future leader by using political, priestly, and prophetic language, it is hard to identify exactly what occupation he had in his socio-historical reality. From his self-proclamation in chs. 61-62, it is clear that he knows the collective memories shared by the returnees and their fathers and grandfathers from the time of exile and even from the time of the monarchy. By relying on that kind of nationalistic language, he nominates himself as the proper leader of the community instead of the established ones of Yehud. In other words, his metaphoric language and his concepts are dependent on what he inherited and learned from his interpretive community. In this vein, we can say that he was influenced by Deutero-Isaiah, the Pentateuch, etc. Meanwhile, as the second generation that shares the collective memory, his appreciation of it is developed into a form of hereditary victimhood as the result of the people's exilic experience. It creates a feeling of aggression against the outgroup, as seen in the case of 62:8. However, the problem is that his message does not resonate with his targeted audience, the ingroup made up of returnees. His message is delivered in a monologic tone in chs. 61-62.

Ironically, Trito-Isaiah is echoed by the pious outgroup when his prophetic message is delivered by the divine authority. Converted foreigners and eunuchs who hold the covenant and keep Sabbath will be invited into the congregation of YHWH in 56:1-8. Furthermore, traditional boundaries of *kohanim* and *levi'im* will be broken up by welcoming new candidates from among those from the Mediterranean who are without issues of ethnicity and class in 66:1-24. This

frame is very inclusive and revolutionary at face value. However, if we keep before the eyes of readers chs. 61-62 within the final form of Trito-Isaiah, as the reader, they may feel a sense of discomfort because of its thematic reversal. Here I interpret these discomforts to be created by the internal inconsistency within the author of Trito-Isaiah himself, not just by textual problems in the process of composition. Since he has admitted ambivalence between his ideal (to want to be a political-priestly leader of the ingroup) and his reality (to preach the prophetic message to the outgroup), he can hardly position himself in between serving the ingroup (returnees) and the outgroup (non-returnees) within the transitional context of the temple building in the late sixth century B.C.E. Therefore Trito-Isaiah's ambivalence is not only a matter of his socio-economic location — that he belongs to the middle-class literate returnees; it is also a matter of his political desire — someone who wants to position himself in the middle of the road between ingroup (returnees) and outgroup (non-returnees).

The problem of Trito-Isaiah's biconceptualism is clearly revealed in 66:22-24. Here he separates another ingroup from an outgroup in his imagined space. The standard is now the depth of commitment, not its socio-geographical status. However, the scene of 66:24 is very aggressive against what we already see in 62:8. Even though Trito-Isaiah uses inclusive rhetoric for inviting the pious outgroup in both bookends, his exclusivist psychology has not changed much as he shows in the core chapters. Reversing Rom-Shiloni, I wish to suggest this Trito-Isaiah psychology of ambivalence as “inclusive exclusivity” during the transitional templeless period as Berges discovered in the cases of 56:1-8 and chs. 60-62 both.¹

¹ Berges, *The Book of Isaiah*, 395, 501.

This research contributes to the effort to locate those who want to navigate the theme of ambivalence within biblical texts. For further research, I can extend the hermeneutics to apply to the reading of other post-exilic literature regarding inclusive exclusivity. The biblical texts are the repository of biconceptual texts, themes, plots, characters, and settings. Furthermore, this research can contribute to an understanding of the conflicts between ideals and reality in the religious field in terms of use and (mis)use of sacred texts.

Bibliography

- Abernethy, Andrew T. "Book Review: *Violence, Otherness and Identity in Isaiah 63:1-6: The Trampling One Coming from Edom.*" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 29.1 (2019): 91-93.
- _____. *Eating in Isaiah: Approaching the Role of Food and Drink in Isaiah's Structure and Message*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Abrams, M. H. *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Ackroyd, P. R. "Isaiah I-XII: Presentation of a Prophet." In *Congress Volume: Göttingen 1977*, Edited by John Emerton, 16-48. VTSup 29. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Ackroyd, P. R. *Studies in the Religious Tradition of the Old Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1995.
- Adams, Samuel L. *Social and Economic Life in Second Temple Judea*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.
- Ahn, Keun-Jo. "이사야 66 장에 나타난 성전(聖殿)논쟁 연구" [A reconsideration of the Temple controversy in Isaiah 66:1-24]. *KJOTS* 19 3 (2013): 293-332.
- Albertz, Rainer. *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* Translated by David Green. Atlanta: SBL, 2001. Originally published in German, 2001.
- Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. Second edition. New York: Rutledge, 2000.
- Allis, Oswald T. *The Unity of Isaiah: A Study in Prophecy*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2000. First published in 1950.
- Alonso-Schökel, L. "Die stilistische Analyse bei den Propheten." In *Congress Volume Oxford 1959*. VTSup 7. Edited by G.W. Anderson, P.A.H. de Boer, G.R. Castellino, Henri Cazelles, E. Hammershaimb, H.G. May, and W. Zimmerli, 154-64. Leiden: Brill, 1960.
- Alt, Albrecht. "The God of the Fathers." In *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*. Translated by R. A. Willson, 1-86. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966. Originally published in German, 1929.

- Alt, Albrecht. "The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine." In *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*. Translated by R. A. Willson, 173-222. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966. Originally published in German, 1925.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. Revised and updated. New York: Basic Books, 2011. First published in 1981.
- Anningson, Ryan. "Once the Buddha Was an Aryan: Race Sciences and the Domestication of Buddhism in North America." *JRC* 27.1 (2017): 57-76.
- Archer, Gleason L., Jr. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Revised edition. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974. First published in 1964.
- Arnold, Bill T. "Forms of Prophetic Speech in the Old Testament: A Summary of Claus Westermann's Contributions." *ATJ* 27 (1995): 30-40.
- Assmann, Aleida. "Cultural Memory." In *Social Trauma: An Interdisciplinary Textbook*, edited by Andreas Hamburger, Camellia Hancheva, and Vamik D. Volkan, 25-36. Heidelberg: Springer, 2020.
- Assmann, Jan. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." *New German Critique* 65, Cultural History/Cultural Studies (Spring–Summer 1995): 125-33.
- _____. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- _____. "Exodus and Memory." In *Afterlife of Events: Perspectives on Mnemohistory*, edited by Marek Tamm, 115-33. Heidelberg: Springer, 2015.
- _____. *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- _____. "The Mosaic Distinction: Israel, Egypt, and the Invention of Paganism." *Representations* 56 (1996): 48-67.
- Auld, A. Graeme. "What If the Chronicler Did Use the Deuteronomistic History?" *BibInt* 8 (2000): 137-50.
- Baden, Joel S. *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*. FAT 68. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

- Bae, Hee-Sook. “이사야 56 장 1-8 절의 재건공동체 (The Restoration Community in Isaiah 56, 1-8)” *KPJT* 39 (2010), 11-34.
- Bae, Sun Bok. *Ethics and Morality in the Priestly Law and Narrative*. PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2021.
- Baden, Joel S. *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*, AYBRL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Bagg, Ariel M. “Palestine under Assyrian Rule: A New Look at the Assyrian Imperial Policy in the West.” *JAOS* 133.1 (2013), 119-44.
- Barker, Margaret. “Isaiah” In *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, edited by James D. G. Dunn, 489-542. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Balentine, Samuel E., Editor. *The Oxford Handbook of Ritual and Worship in the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Balla, Emil. *Die Droh- und Scheltworte des Amos*. Leipzig: Edelman, 1926.
- Bang, Ki-Min. *The Combat Myth Motif in Psalm 89: Redaction Historical and Environmental Analyses*. PhD diss., Lutheran School of Theology, 2020.
- Banks, Diane Nunn. *Writing the History of Israel*. LHBOTS 438. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Barthes, Roland. *Elements of Semiology*. Translated by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967. Originally published in 1964.
- . “The Death of the Author” In *Image, Music, Text*, Translated by Stephen Heath, 142-148. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.
- Barstard, Hans M. “Isaiah 56-66 in Relation to Isaiah 40-55: Why a New Reading is Necessary.” In *Continuity and Discontinuity: Chronological and Thematic Development in Isaiah 40-66*, Edited by Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer and Hans M. Barstad, 41-62. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.
- . *The Babylonian Captivity of the Book of Isaiah: “Exilic” Judah and the Provenance of Isaiah 40-55*. Oslo: Novus Forlag, 1997.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. “The Exclusion of Netinim and Proselytes in 4Q Florilegium.” *Revue de Qumrân* 8.1 (1972): 87-96.

- _____. *Studies in Qumran Law*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. "Hereditary Victimhood: The Holocaust's Life as a Ghost." *Tikkun* 13.4 (1998): 33-38.
- _____. "The Holocaust's Life as a Ghost" In *Social Theory after the Holocaust*. Edited by Robert Fine and Charles Turner, 7-18. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.
- Bayer, Scott P. *We All Know What Happened to Micah: Micah and Trauma Theory*. PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2021.
- Beale, Gregory K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2004.
- Becker, Uwe. "The Book of Isaiah: Composition History" In *The Oxford Handbook of Isaiah*, Edited by Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, 37-58. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Becking, Bob. "In Babylon: The Exile in Historical (Re)construction" In *From Babylon to Eternity: The Exile Remembered and Constructed in Text and Tradition*. Edited by Bob Becking, Alex Cannegieter Wilfred van de Poll, and Anne-Mareike Wetter, 4-33. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Bedford, Peter Ross. "Diaspora: Homeland Relations in Ezra-Nehemiah" *VT* 52.2 (2002): 147-65.
- _____. "On Models and Texts: A Response to Blenkinsopp and Petersen." In *Persian Period*, Edited by Philip R. Davies, 154-62. vol. 1 of *Second Temple Studies*. JSOTSup 117. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- _____. *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Beuken, Wim. "Does Trito-Isaiah Reject the Temple? An Intertextual Inquiry into Isa. 66:1-6." In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in honor of Bas Van Israel*. Edited by Spike Draisma, 53-66. Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok, 1989.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Introduction—Setting an Agenda." In *Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy*, Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Michael H. Floyd, 1-29. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- _____. "Reshaping the Memory of Zedekiah and His Period in Chronicles." In *Congress Volume Munich 2013*. VTSup 163. Edited by Christl M. Maier, 370-95. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

- _____. "The Study of Forgetting and the Forgotten in Ancient Israelite Discourse/s: Observations and Test Cases." In *Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis*. Edited by Niels Peter Lemche, Pernille Carstens, and Trine Hasselbalch, 139-57. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012.
- Berge, Stefan. "The Invention of European National Traditions in European Romanticism" In *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, ed. Daniel Woolf, vol. 4, 1800-1945, ed. Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maiguashca, and Attila Pók, 19-40. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Berges, Ulrich. *The Book of Isaiah: Its Composition and Final Form*, HBM 46. Translated by Millard Lind. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012. = *Das Buch Jesaja: Komposition und Endgestalt*. Freiburg: Herder, 1998.
- Bergsma, John Sietze. *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation*. VTSup 115. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Berlin, Adele., and Marc Zvi Brettler. Editors. *The Jewish Study Bible: JPS TANAKH Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Berquist, Jon L. *Judaism in Persia's Shadow: A Social and Historical Approach*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2003. Originally published in 1995.
- _____. "Reading Difference in Isaiah 56-66: The Interplay of Literary and Sociological Strategies." *MTSR* 7.1 (1995): 23-42.
- _____. "Spaces of Jerusalem." in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*. Edited by Claudia V. Camp and Jon L. Berquist, 40-52. New York: T&T Clark. 2008.
- _____. "The Social Setting of Malachi." *BTB* 19 (1989): 121-6.
- Beuken, W. A. M. "Isaiah Chapters LXV-LXVI: Trito-Isaiah and the Closure of the Book of Isaiah." In *Congress Volume Leuven 1989*. VTSup 43. Edited by J. A. Emerton, 204-221. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- _____. "Jesaja 33 als Spiegeltext im Jesajabuch." 5-35. *ETL* 67.1 (1991) 5-35.
- Berverley, John. *Subalternity and Representation: Arguments in Cultural Theory*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999.

Beyerlin, Walter. *Die Rettung der Bedrängten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen auf institutionelle Zusammenhänge untersucht*. FRLANT 99. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

Bérubé, Michael. *Rhetorical Occasions: Essays on Humanities*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Bhabha, Homi K. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." In *October* 28 (1984): 125-133.

_____. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Bienkowski, Piotr. "Eunuchs." In *Dictionary of the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Piotr Bienkowski and Alan Millard, 110. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Black, C. Clifton. "Keeping up with Recent Studies: XVI. Rhetorical Criticism and Biblical Interpretation." *The Expository Times* 100.7 (1989): 252-258.

Black, Max. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Abraham and Cyrus in Isaiah 40–48." In *New Perspectives on Old Testament Prophecy and History: Essays in Honour of Hans M. Barstad*, VTSup 168. Edited by Rannfrid I. Thelle, Terje Stordalen, and Mervyn E.J. Richardson, 29-41. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

_____. "A Jewish Sect of the Persian Period." *CBQ* 52.1 (1990): 5-20.

_____. *Essays on Judaism in the Pre-Hellenistic Period*. BZAW 495. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017.

_____. *Ezekiel*, IBC. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990.

_____. *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*, OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988.

_____. *Isaiah 40-55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 19A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

_____. *Isaiah 56-66: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 19B. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

- _____. "The Mission of Udgahorresnet and Those of Ezra and Nehemiah." *JBL* 106 (1987): 409–21.
- _____. "The Servant and the Servants in Isaiah and the Formation of the Book." In *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. vol. 1. VTSup 70/1. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, 155-76. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. "Trito-Isaiah (Isaiah 56-66) and the *Gōlāh* Group of Ezra, Shecaniah, and Nehemiah (Ezra 7-Nehemiah 13). Is There a Connection?" *JSOT* 43.4 (2019): 661-77.
- _____. "Was the Pentateuch the Civic and Religious Constitution of the Jewish Ethnos in the Persian Period?" In *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*. Edited by James W. Watts, 41-62. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001.
- Blum, Erhard. "Formgeschichte - A Misleading Category? Some Critical Remarks" in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi, 32-45. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Bradway, Tyler. *Queer Experimental Literature: The Affective Politics of Bad Reading*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Brandist, Craig. "The Bakhtin Circle." In *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://iep.utm.edu/bakhtin/>.
- Brett, Mark G. *Locations of God: Political Theology in the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Briant, Pierre. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Translated by Peter T. Daniels. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002. Originally published in French, 1996.
- Bright, John. *A History of Israel*. Fourth edition. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000.
- Brown, Francis. S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic (BDB)*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997. Based on the lexicon of William Gesenius. Originally published in Boston, 1906.
- Brownlee, William H. "Gilgal." In *ISBE*. Revised edition. vol. 2, 470-72. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979.

- _____. "The Manuscripts of Isaiah from Which DSI^a Was Copied." *BASOR* 127 (1952): 16-21.
- _____. *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible: With Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Biblical Committee of Catholic Bishops' Conference of Korea, 주석성경 [*Juseokseonggyeong*]. Seoul: Catholic Bishops' Conference of Korea, 2010. based on *TOB*. (Online) <https://bible.cbck.or.kr/Knbnotes/Bible/Ls/56>
- Bimson, John J. "The Origins of Israel in Canaan: An Examination of Recent Theories." In *Themelios* 15.1 (1989): 4-15.
- Boda, Mark J., Carol J. Dempsey, and LeAnn Snow Flesher, Editors. *Daughter Zion: Her Portraits, Her Response*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Boer, Roland. *The Sacred Economy of Ancient Israel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015.
- Bonnard, Pierre-Émile. *Le Second Isaïe: Son Disciple et Leurs Éditeurs Isaïe 40-66*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1972.
- Booth, Wayne. *Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Botterweck, G. J. "chazir" in *TDOT*, Vol IV, 291-300. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *Sparks of the Logos: Essays in Rabbinic Hermeneutics*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- _____. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Brettler, Marc Zvi. *God Is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor*. LHBOTS 76. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2009.
- Bull, Anna Cento., and Hans Lauge Hansen, "On Agonistic Memory." *Memory Studies* 9.4. (2015): 390-404.
- Buss, Martin J. *Biblical Form Criticism and its Context*. JSOTSup 274. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

- _____. "Form Criticism" in *To Each Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Applications*. First edition. Edited by Stephen R. Haynes and Steven L. McKenzie, 69-86. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.
- Buss, Martin J. *The Changing Shape of Form Criticism: A Relational Approach*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010.
- Byrskog, Samuel. "Form Criticism." in *The Dictionary of the Bible and Ancient Media*. Edited by Tom Tacher, Chris Keith, Raymond F. Person Jr. and Elsie R. Stern, 142-5. New York: T&T Clark, 2017.
- Byun, Seul-gi L. "The Biblical Texts of Isaiah at Qumran" in *Bind Up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah*. Edited by Daniel Issac Block and Richard L. Schultz, 65-80. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015.
- Campbell, Joseph J. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1949.
- Carroll, Robert P. "Ancient Israelite Prophecy and Dissonance Theory." *Numen* 24.2 (1977): 135-51.
- _____. "Prophecy and Dissonance: A Theoretical Approach to the Prophetic Tradition." In *ZAW* 92 (1980): 108-19.
- _____. "Twilight of Prophecy or Dawn of Apocalyptic?" *JSOT* 14 (1979): 3-35.
- _____. *When Prophecy Failed: Cognitive Dissonance in the Prophetic Traditions of the Old Testament*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1979.
- Carr, David M. *Holy Resilience: The Bible's Traumatic Origins*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.
- _____. "Reaching for Unity in Isaiah." *JSOT* 57 (1993): 61-80.
- _____. "Reading Isaiah from Beginning (Isaiah 1) to End (Isaiah 65-66): Multiple Modern Possibilities" in *New Visions of Isaiah*, JSOTSup 214. Edited by Roy F. Melugin and Marvin A. Sweeney, 190-93. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- _____. *The Formation of Bible: A New Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Cataldo, Jeremiah W. *A Theocratic Yehud? Issues of Government in a Persian Province*. LHBOTS 498. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.

- Carter, Charles E. *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Chavel, Simeon. *Oracular Law and Priestly Historiography in the Torah*, FAT 2.71. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Cheyne, Thomas K. *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah: With an Appendix Containing the Undoubted Portions of the Two Chief Prophetic Writers in a Translation*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1895.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- _____. *Isaiah: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster, John Knox Press, 2001.
- _____. *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis*. London: SCM Press, 1967.
- Chae, Moon Kwon. *The Radical Idea of the Priesthood of Foreigners: Understanding the Inclusivism in Isaiah 56:1-8*. PhD diss., Baylor University, 2021.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "A Small History of Subaltern Studies" in *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*. Edited by Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 467-487. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005.
- _____. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Cho, Eun Suk. *Josianic Reform in the Deuteronomistic History Reconstructed in the Light of Factionalism and Use of Royal Apology*. PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2002.
- Cho, Paul K. -K. *Myth, History, and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Choi, Jeaman (Jaeman). *Three Portrayals of King Hezekiah: A Comparison of 2 Kings 18-20, Isaiah 36-39, and 2 Chronicles 2*. PhD diss., McMaster Divinity College, 2015.
- Clements, Ronald E. "Beyond Tradition-History: Deutero-Isaianic Development of First Isaiah's Themes?" *JSOT* 31 (1985): 95-113.

- _____. "Isaiah: A Book without an Ending?" *JSOT* 97, 2002 (2002): 109-126.
- _____. "The Davidic Covenant in the Isaiah Tradition" in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E. W. Nicholson*. Edited by A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salters. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- _____. "Unity of the Book of Isaiah." *Int* 36. (1982): 117-20.
- Clifford, Richard J. "The Unity of the Book of Isaiah and Its Cosmogonic Language." *CBQ* 55 (1993): 1-17.
- Cogan, Mordechai., and Hayim Tadmor "Gyges and Ashurbanipal: A Study in Literary Transmission." *Orientalia* 46 (1977): 65-85.
- Conrad, Edgar W. *Reading Isaiah*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Cook, Steven L., "Apocalyptic Prophecy" in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*. Edited by John J. Collins, 19-35. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- _____. *Ezekiel 38-48: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 22B. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.
- _____. "Prophecy and Apocalyptic" in *The Oxford Handbook of the Prophets*. Edited by Carolyn J. Sharp, 67-86. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- _____. *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995.
- _____. "Second Isaiah and the Aaronide Response to Judah's Forced Migrations." In *The Prophets Speak on Forced Migration*. Edited by Mark J. Boda, Frank Ritzel Ames, John Ahn, and Mark Leuchter, 47-62. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Cook, Steven L., and Corrine L. Patton. "Introduction: Hierarchical Thinking and Theology in Ezekiel's Book." In *Ezekiel's Hierarchical World: Wrestling With A Tiered Reality*. Edited by Stephen L. Cook and Corrine L. Patton, 1-26. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2004.
- Coote, Robert B. and David Robert Ord, *The Bible's First History: From Eden to the Court of David with the Yahwist*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Cranz, Isabel *Atonement and Purification: Priestly and Assyro-Babylonian Perspectives on Sin and Its Consequences*. FAT 2.92. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

- Cross, Frank Moore., Jr. "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times." *HTR* 59 (1966): 201-11.
- _____. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997. Originally published in 1973.
- Curtis, Bryon G. *Up the Steep and Stony Road: The Book of Zechariah in Social Location Trajectory Analysis*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2006.
- Dandamaev, Muhammad A. "Achaemenid Imperial Policies and Provincial Governments." *Iranica Antiqua*, 34 (1999): 269-82.
- _____. *A Political History of Achaemenid Empire*. Translated by W. J. Vogelsang. Leiden: Brill, 1989. Originally published in Russian in 1985.
- _____. *Slavery in Babylonia: From Nabopolassar to Alexander the Great (626-331 BC)*, Revised Edition. Translated by Victoria A. Powell. Edited by Marvin A. Powell and David B. Weisberg. Northern Illinois University Press, 1984. Originally published in Russian in 1974.
- Dandamaev, Muhammad A., and Vladimir G. Lukonin, *The Culture and Social Institution of Ancient Iran*. Translated by Philip L. Kohl and D. J. Dadson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Darr, John A. *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*, JSNTSup 163. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998. = "'Glorified in the Presence of Kings,'" A Literary-Critical Study of Herod in the Tetrarch in Luke-Acts." PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 1987.
- Darr, Katheryn Pfisterer. *Isaiah's Vision and the Family of God*, LCBI. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Davidson, William, Editor. *Babylonian Talmud*. Sefaria.
https://www.sefaria.org/Bava_Batra.15a.2?ven=William_Davidson_Edition_-_English&vhe=William_Davidson_Edition_-_Vocalized_Aramaic&lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en.
- Davies, Philip R. "Method and Madness: Some Remarks on Doing History with the Bible." *JBL* 114.4 (1995): 699-705.

- _____. *In Search of "Ancient Israel": A Study in Biblical Origins*, JSOTSup 148. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Origins of Biblical Israel*. LHBOTS 485. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Davidson, Steed V. "The Imperial End: How Empire Overtakes Refugees in Jeremiah." *Political Theology* 19.6 (2018): 460-77.
- Dawson, Lorne L. "Prophetic Failure in Millennial Movements." In *The Oxford Handbook of Millennialism*. Edited by Catherine Wessinger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Day, John. *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- _____. "Inner-Biblical Interpretation in the Prophets." In *"The Place Is Too Small for Us": The Israelite Prophets in Recent Scholarship*. Edited by Robert P. Gordon, 230-46. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 1995.
- de Hulster, Izaak. J. *Iconographic Exegesis and Third Isaiah*, FAT 2.36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- de Saussure, Ferdinand. *The Course in General Linguistics*. Translated by Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. Originally published in 1916.
- de Vaux, Roland. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by John McHugh. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1961. Originally published in French, 1958-1960.
- de Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht. *A Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament*, vol. 2. Translated by Theodore Parker. Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1843. = *Lehrbuch der Historisch-Kritischen Einleitung in die Kanonischen und Apokryphischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 1817.
- Dell, Katharine J. *The Solomonic Corpus of 'Wisdom' and Its Influence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- DesCamp, Mary Therese., and Eve Sweester, "Metaphors for God: Why and How Do Our Choices Matter for Humans? The Application of Contemporary Cognitive Linguistics Research to the Debate on God and Metaphor." *Pastoral Psychology* 53 (2005): 207-38.
- Dietrich, Walter. *Prophetie Und Geschichte: Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung Zum Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*, FRLANT 108. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

- _____. "Martin Noth and the Future of the Deuteronomistic History." Translated by Dwight R. Daniels. In *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*, Edited by S. L. McKenzie and M. P. Graham, 153-75. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Dillard, Raymond., and Tremper Longman. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, Second Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006. Originally published in 1994.
- Dim, Emmanuel Uchenna. *The Eschatological Implications of Isa 65 and 66 as the Conclusion of the Book of Isaiah*. New York: Peter Lang, 2005.
- Döderlein, Johann Christoph. *Esaias, ex recensione textus hebraei*. Altorfi: Venum prostat in officina Schuipfeliana, 1780. First edition was published in Latin, 1775; Third edition in 1788.
- Dozeman, Thomas B., and Konrad Schmid, Editor. *Farewell to the Yahwist?: The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. SBLSymp 34. Atlanta: Society Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Duhm, Bernhard. *Das Buch Jesaia*. Second edition. HKAT III, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902. Originally published in 1892.
- Duling, Dennis C. "Social Memory and Commemoration of the Death of 'the Lord': Paul's Response to the Lord's Supper Factions at Corinth." In *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz*. Semeia 78. Edited by Tom Thatcher, 289-312. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.
- Eaton, John H. "The Origin of the Book of Isaiah." *VT* 9 (1959): 138-57.
- Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, vol. 3. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1783.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament: Unter Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen. Entstehungsgeschichte des Alten Testaments*. Tübingen: JCB Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1934.
- Elliger, Karl. *Deuterojesaja*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978.
- _____. *Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
- _____. *Die Einheit des Tritojesaja (Jesaia 56-66)*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928.

- Elrefaei, Aly. *Ancient Israel and Its Religious History in the Works of Julius Wellhausen and Yehezkel Kaufmann*. BZAW 490. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016.
- Endres, S. J., John C., William R. Millar, and John Barclay Burns, Editors. *Chronicles and Its Synoptic Parallels in Samuel, Kings, and Related Biblical Texts*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Engnell, Ivan. "New Year Festivals" In *The Myth and Ritual Theory: An Anthology*, edited by Robert A. Segal, 136-40. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.
- Eph'al, Israel. "Syria-Palestine under Achaemenid Rule." In *The Cambridge Ancient History, Second Edition. Volume IV: Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean. c. 525 to 479 B.C.*, Edited by John Boardman, N. G. L. Hammond, D. M. Lewis, M. Ostwald, 139-64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Evans, Craig A. "On the Unity and Parallel Structure of Isaiah." *VT* 38 (1988): 129-47.
- Ewald, Heinrich. *Die Propheten des alten Bundes*, 2 vols. Stuttgart: Adolph Krabbe, 1840-1841.
- _____. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1843-1859).
- Exum, J. Cheryl. "Of Broken Pots, Fluttering Birds and Visions in the Night: Extended Simile and Poetic Technique in Isaiah." *CBQ* 43.3 (1981): 331-52.
- Fackenheim, Emil. "The 614th Commandment." *Judaism* 16 (1967): 269-73.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin White Mask*. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann. London: Pluto Press, 2008. Originally published in French in 1952.
- _____. *The Wretched of The Earth*. Foreword by Homi K. Bhabha. Translated by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press 2004. Originally published in French, 1961.
- Fantalkin, Alexander, and Oren Tal. "Redating Lachish Level I: Identifying Achaemenid Imperial Policy at the Southern Frontier of the Fifth Satrapy." In *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, edited by Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming, 167-98. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Routledge, 2002. Originally published in 1969.
- Fernandez, Eleazar S. "Empire, Global Hegemony, and the Theo-Political Practice of the Subaltern *Minjung*." In *Minjung Theology Today: Contextual and Intercultural*

- Perspectives*. Edited by Jin-Kwan Kwon and Volker Küster, 205-20. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2018.
- Festinger, Leon., Henry W. Riecken, and Stanley Schachter. *When Prophecy Fails: A Social and Psychological Study of a Modern Group that Predicted the Destruction of the World*. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.
- Feldman, Liane M. *The Story of Sacrifice: Ritual and Narrative in the Priestly Source*, FAT 141. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- Finkelstein, Israel. "The Settlement History of Jerusalem in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BC" *RB* 115.4 (2008): 499-515.
- Finkelstein, Israel, and Neil Asher Silberman. "Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, the Remaking of Judah and the Rise of the Pan-Israelite Ideology." *JSOT* 30 (2006): 259-85.
- _____. *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Sacred Texts*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002.
- Finlay, Timothy D. *The Birth Report Genre in the Hebrew Bible*, FAT 2.12. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Fischer, J. *Das Buch Isaias II*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1939.
- Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- _____. "Why No One's Afraid of Wolfgang Iser: The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response by Wolfgang Iser." *Diacritics* 11.1 (1981): 2-13.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Fitzgerald, Curtis W. *A Rhetorical Analysis of Isaiah 56-66*. PhD diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2003.
- Fohrer, Georg. *Das Buch Jesaja: 3 Band, Kapitel 40-66*. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1964.
- _____. *Jesaja als Zusammenfassung der Verkündigung Jesajas*, ZAW 74. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962.

- _____. "The Origin, Composition and Tradition of Isaiah I-XXXIX." In *Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society* 3 (1961): 3-38.
- Flanagan, James W. "History as Hologram: Integrating Literary, Archaeological, and Comparative Sociological Evidence." In SBLSP 1985. Edited by Kent Harold Richards, 291-314. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985:
- Freud, Sigmund. *Moses and Monotheism*. 1939.
- _____. *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. Trans. James Strachey. New York: Routledge, 2001. Originally published in German, 1913.
- Freedman, Amelia Devin. *God as an Absent Character in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Literary-Theoretical Study*. New York: Peter Lang, 2005.
- Frei, Peter. "Persian Imperial Authorization: A Summary." In *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*. Edited by James W. Watts, 5-40. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001.
- Fried, Lisbeth S. "Cyrus the Messiah? The Historical Background to Isaiah 45:1." *HTR* 95.4 (2002): 373-393.
- _____. "Did Ezra Create Judaism?" In *Marbeh Hokmah: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East in Loving Memory of Victor Avigdor Hurowitz*. Edited by Shamir Yonah, Edward L. Greenstein, Mayer I. Gruber, Peter Machinist, and Shalom M. Paul, 171-184. Winona Lake, IN, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- _____. *The Priest and the Great King: Temple-Palace Relations in the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake, IN, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.
- Friedman, Richard E. *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works*, HSM 22. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Frolov, Serge. "Is Form Criticism Compatible with Diachronic Exegesis? Rethinking Genesis 1-2 after Knierim and Sweeney." In *Partners with God: Theological and Critical Readings of the Bible in Honor of Marvin A. Sweeney*. Edited by Shelley L. Birdsong and Serge Frolov, 13-26. Claremont, CA: Claremont Press, 2017.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Gaines, Jason M. H. *The Poetic Priestly Source*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2015.

- Garber Jr. David G. "Trauma Theory and Biblical Studies." *CBR* 14.1 (2015): 24-44.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Der Prophet Jesaia*, vol. 2. Leipzig: F. Ch. Wilh, 1821.
- Gileadi, Avraham. *The Literary Message of Isaiah*. New York: Hebraeus Press, 1994.
- Gingrich, Andre. "The German-Speaking Countries." In *One Discipline, Four Ways British, German, French, and American Anthropology*. Edited by Fredrik Barth, Andre Gingrich, Robert Parkin, and Sydel Silverman, 61-156. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2005.
- Gitay, Yehoshua. *Rhetorical Analysis of Isaiah 40-48: A Study of the Art of Prophetic Persuasion*. PhD diss., Emory University, 1978.
- Gnuse, Robert K. "Redefining the Elohist." *JBL* 119.2 (2000): 201-220.
- Goldenstein, Johannes. *Das Gebet der Gottesknechte: Jesaja 63,7-64,11 im Jesajabuch*, WMANT 92. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001.
- Goldingay, John. *Isaiah 56-66: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 3. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014a.
- _____. *The Theology of the Book of Isaiah*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2014b.
- Grabbe, Lester L. "Josephus and the Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration." *JBL* 106.2 (1987): 231-46.
- Graetz, H. "Isaiah XXXIV. and XXXV" *JQR* 4.1. (1891): 1-8.
- Grand, Sue., and Jill Salberg, Editors. *The Wounds of History: Repair and Resilience in the Transgenerational Transmission of Trauma*. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- _____. "Trans-Generational Transmission of Trauma." In *Social Trauma: An Interdisciplinary Textbook*. Edited Andreas Hamburger, Camellia Hancheva, and Vamik D. Volkan, 209-18. Heidelberg: Springer, 2020.
- Grady, Joseph Edward. *Foundations of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary Scenes*. PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 1997.
- Green, Barbara. *How Are The Mighty Fallen? A Dialogical Study Of King Saul In 1 Samuel*. LHBOTS 365. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

- _____. *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship: An Introduction*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Greenblatt, Stephan. "The Forms of Power and the Power of Forms in the Renaissance." *Genre* 15 (1982): 1-4.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien. *Structural Semantics: An Attempt at a Method*. Translated by R. Schleifer and D. McDowell. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983. Originally published in French, 1968.
- Gressmann, Hugo. *Die Älteste Geschichtsschreibung Und Prophetie Israels*, 1910.
- Grohmann, Marianne and Hyun Chul Paul Kim, Editors. *Second Wave Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, RBS 93. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2019.
- Grossman, Maxine L. "Roland Barthes and the Teacher of Righteousness: The Death of the Author of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H Lim and John J. Collins Charlotte. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Gruber, Mayer I. "The Motherhood of God in Second Isaiah." *RB* 90.3 (1983): 351-9.
- Guha, Ranajit. *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999. Originally published in Delhi, 1983.
- Guillaume, Philippe. "Jerusalem 720-705 BCE. No Flood of Israelite Refugees." *SJOT* 22 (2008): 195-211.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *An Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*. Completed by Joachim Begrich, Translated by James D. Nogalski, Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998. The original German edition is *Die Psalmen*, HKAT II, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.
- _____. *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation*. Translated by K. William Whitney Jr. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006. The original German edition is, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895.
- _____. "The Israelite Prophecy from the Time of Amos. In *Twentieth Century Theology in the Making: Themes of Biblical Theology*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan, Translated by R. A.

- Wilson, 48-75. New York: Harper & Row, 1969. This is an excerpt from *RGG*. Second edition in 1927-32.
- _____. "The Prophet as Writers and Poets." In *Prophecy in Israel: Search for an Identity*. Translated by J. L. Schaaf. Edited by David L. Petersen. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987: 22-73.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Translated by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Halpern, Baruch. *The First Historians The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Ham, Sok Hon, *Queen of Suffering: A Spiritual History of Korea*. Translated by E. Sang Yu. London: Friends World Committee for Consultation, 1985.
- Hanson, Paul D. "'Apocalypse, Genre.'" "Apocalypticism." In *IBDSup*, 27-34. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1976.
- Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*, revised edition. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979. Originally published in 1975.
- _____. *The People Called: The Growth of Community in the Bible*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1986.
- Haran, Menahem. "Behind the Scenes of History: Determining the Date of the Priestly Source." In *JBL* 100.3 (1981) 321-333.
- _____. *Temples & Temple Service in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- _____. "The Gibeonite, the Nethinim and the Sons of Solomon's Servants." *VT* 11.1 (1961): 159-69.
- _____. "The Literary Structure and Chronological Framework of the Prophecies in Is. XL-XLVIII" In *Congress Volume Bonn 1962*. VTSup 9. Edited by G. W. Anderson, P.A.H. de Boer, G.R. Castellino, Henry Cazelles, E. Hammershaimb, H. G. May, and W. Zimmerli, 127-55. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Harmon-Jones, Eddie., and Judson Mills, Editors. *Cognitive Dissonance: Reexamining a Pivotal Theory in Psychology*, Second edition. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1999.

- Harris, Marvin. *Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for a Science of Culture*. New York: Random House, 1979.
- Hayes, John H. *Old Testament Form Criticism*. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974.
- _____. "The History of the Form-Critical Study of Prophecy" In *Interpreting Ancient Israelite History, Prophecy, and Law*. Edited by Brad E. Kelle. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017: 194-201. Originally published in 1973.
- Hayes, John H., and Stuart A. Irvine, *Isaiah, the Eighth Century Prophet: His Times & His Preaching*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1987.
- Hays, Christopher B. "Make Peace with Me: The Josianic Origins of Isaiah 24–27" *Int* 73.2 (2019): 143-57.
- _____. *The Origins of Isaiah 24-27: Josiah's Festival Scroll for the Fall of Assyria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, vol. 1. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974; translation from the second edition in German, 1973.
- Hens-Piazza, Gina. *Of Methods, Monarchs, and Meanings: Sociorhetorical Approach to Exegesis*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996.
- _____. *The New Historicism*, OTS. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Hirsh, Marianne. "Presidential Address 2014: Connective Histories in Vulnerable Times." *PMLA* 129.4 (2014): 330-348.
- _____. *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
- Hirschy, Noah Calvin. *Artaxerxes III Ochus and His Reign: With Special Consideration of the Old Testament Sources Bearing Upon the Period*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909.
- Hoglund, Keneth G. *Achaemenid Imperial Administration in Syria-Palestine and the Missions of Ezra and Nehemiah*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Holladay, W. L. *Isaiah: Scroll of a Prophetic Heritage*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.

- Holland, Norman N., and Wayne C. Booth. "Interview: Wolfgang Iser." *Diacritics* 10.2 (1980): 57-74.
- Holub, Robert. "Reception Theory: School of Constance." In *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 8, From Formalism to Poststructuralism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Hong, Koog P. "The Deceptive Pen of Scribes: Judean Reworking of the Bethel Tradition as a Program for Assuming Israelite Identity." *Bib* 92.3 (2011): 427-441.
- _____. *Towards the Hermeneutics of Responsibility: A Linguistic, Literary, and Historical Reading of Genesis 28:10–22*. PhD diss., Claremont Graduate University, 2011.
- Horsely, Richard A. ed. *Hidden Transcripts and The Arts of Resistance: Applying the Works of James C. Scott to Jesus and Paul*, Edited by Richard A. Horsley. Boston: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Howard Jr., David M. and Michael A. Grisanti, Editors. *Giving the Sense: Understanding and Using Old Testament Historical Texts*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2003.
- Hölbl, Günther. *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, Translated by Tina Saavedra. New York: Routledge, 2000. Originally published in German in 1994.
- Huffman, Herbert B. "Exodus, Sinai and the Credo." *CBQ* 27.2 (1965): 101-113.
- Hugenberger, Gordon Paul. *Marriage as a Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage Developed from the Perspective of Malachi*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Hultgren, Stephen. *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Hung, Si Wai Hedy. *Eschatological Concepts in Trito-Isaiah*. PhD diss. University of Aberdeen, 2014.
- Hunt, Alice. *Missing Priests: The Zadokites in Tradition and History*. LHBOTS 452. New York: T&T Clark: 2006.
- Ibn Ezra, Abraham ben Meïr, *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*. vol. 1, *Translation of the Commentary*, Translated and Edited by M. Friedländer. London: N. Trübner, 1873.

Irudayaraj, Dominic S. *Violence, Otherness and Identity in Isaiah 63:1-6: The Trampling One Coming from Edom*. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.

Iser, Wolfgang. *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

_____. "Talk Like Whales: A Reply to Stanley Fish." *Diacritics* 11.3 (1981): 82-87.

_____. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.

_____. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Jacobs, Mignon. and Raymond F. Person Jr. Editors, *Israelite Prophecy and the Deuteronomistic History: Portrait, Reality, and the Formation of a History*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

Jang, Jae. "A Critique on Alt's Classification of Law" *EOTS* 2 (2006): 165-181.

Jang, Sehoon. "Is Hezekiah a Success or a Failure?: The Literary Function of Isaiah's Prediction at the End of the Royal Narratives in the Book of Isaiah." *JSOT* 42.1 (2017): 117-35.

Japhet, Sara. "Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel: Against the Background of the Historical and Religious Tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah No.1." *ZAW* 94.1 (1982): 66-98.

_____. "Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel: Against the Background of the Historical and Religious Tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah No.2." *ZAW* 95.2 (1983): 218-229.

Jeon, Beon Jin. *Rhetoric of the Book of Amos: Amos for the Seventh-Century Judean Audience*. PhD diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2015.

Jeon, Jaeyoung. *The Call of Moses and the Exodus Story: A Redactional-critical Study in Exodus 3-4 and 5-13*. FAT 2.60. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

_____. "The Zadokite and Levite Scribal Conflicts and Hegemonic Struggles" In *Scripture as Social Discourse: Social-Scientific Perspectives on Early Jewish and Christian Writings*. Edited by Jessica M. Keacy, Todd Klutz and C. A. Strine, 97-110. New York: T&T Clark, 2017.

_____. "The Levites and Idolatry: A Scribal Debate in Ezekiel 44 and Chronicles." In *Chronicles and the Priestly Literature: Literary-Historical and Ideological Relationships*

- between Chronicles, Ezekiel, and the Pentateuch*. BZAW 528. Edited by Jaeyoung Jeon and Louis Jonker, 348-76. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021.
- Jindo, Job Y. *Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered: A Cognitive Approach to Poetic Prophecy in Jeremiah 1-24*. HSM 64. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010.
- Joachimsen, Kristin. *Identities in Transition: The Pursuit of Isa. 52:13-53:12*. VTSup 142. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Jones, Douglas R. *Isaiah 56-66 and Joel*. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- Jones, Douglas R. "The Tradition of the Oracles of Isaiah of Jerusalem." *ZAW* 67 (1955): 226-246.
- Jung, Carl G. *Answer to Job*. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. New York: Pastoral Psychology Book Club, 1955. First published in German, 1952.
- Jung, Jaewoong. *Fullfilled in Our Bodies: Embodied Experience of the Divine Presence in Preaching*. PhD diss. Garrett-Evangelical Theoloical Seminary, 2020.
- Kagan, Donald. *The Fall of the Athenian Empire*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987.
- Kahle, Paul. *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1951.
- Kaiser, Otto. *Introduction to the Old Testament: A Presentation of its Results and Problems*, trans. John Sturdy. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Press, 1975. Translated from the revised edition in 1973. Originally published in German, 1969.
- Kang, EunHee. *The Dialogic Significance of the Sojourner, the Fatherless, and the Widow in Deuteronomy Through an Analysis of Chronotopes Using Bakhtin's Reading Strategy*. PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2009.
- Kaufmann, Yehezkel. *The Babylonian Captivity and Deutero-Isaiah*. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1970.
- _____. *The Religion of Israel: From Its Beginnings to the Baylonian Exile*. Abridged version. Translated by Moshe Greenberg. Jerusalem: Sefer ve-Sefel Publishing, 2003. Originally published in Hebrew, 1960.
- Kelle, Brad E. *Hosha 2: Metaphor and Rhetoric in Historical Perspective*. PhD diss., Emory University, 2003.

- Kennedy, George A. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Kessler, John. “Persia’s Loyal Yahwists: Power Identity and Ethnicity in Achaemenid Yehud.” In *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*. Edited by Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming, 91-121. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Kessler, Werner. *Gott geht es um das Ganze: Jesaja 56-66 und Jesaja 24-27*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960.
- _____. “Studie zur religiösen Situation im ersten nacheilischen Jahrhundert und zur Auslegung von Jesaja 56-66.” *WZCH* 6 (1956/57) 41-43.
- _____. “Zur Auslegung von Jesaja 56-66.” *ThLZ* 81 (1956):335-8.
- Kim, Ayun. *The Communal Lament of the Servants of YHWH in Isaiah 63:7-64:11*. PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2019.
- Kim, Dong-Hyuk. “제 3 이사야의 안식일 신학: 이사야 56 장 1-8 절과 58 장 13-14 절에 대한 주석적 연구” [The Sabbath in Third Isaiah: An Exegetical Study of Isa 56:1-8 and 58:13-14]. *KJOTS* 24.2 (2018): 12-36.
- Kim, Hae-Kwon Kim, 하나님 나라 신학으로 읽는 이사야 40-66 장 [*Reading Isaiah 40-66 through the Theology of the Kingdom of God*]. Seoul: Boggitneun Saram, 2020.
- Kim, Hyun Chul Paul. “A Farewell to Trito-Isaiah?: An Inner-Biblical Exegesis of Isaiah 54-57 in Light of Isaiah 1-2 and Psalm 1.” *Canon & Culture* 9.1 (2015): 35-70.
- _____. *Ambiguity, Tension, and Multiplicity in Deutero-Isaiah*. New York: Peter Lang, 2003.
- _____. “Interpretive Modes of Yin-Yang Dynamics as Asian Hermeneutics.” *BibInt* 9 (2001): 287-308.
- _____. *Reading Isaiah: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Chewy Publishing, 2016.
- Kim, Koowon. *Type-scene in the Aqhatu, Kirta, and Hannah Stories: A Form-critical and Narratological Study of KTU 1.14 I-1.15 III, 1.17 I-II, and 1 Samuel 1:1-2:11*, VTSup 145. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

- Kim, Soo J. (a.k.a Soo J. Kim Sweeney), "Eschatology in Isaiah." In *The Oxford Handbook of Isaiah*, Edited by Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, 352-74. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Kim, Tae-Hun. *Assyrian Historical Inscriptions and Political and Economic Relations Among Assyria, the Syro-Palestinian States, and Egypt in the Eighth-Seventh Centuries BCE*. PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2002.
- Kim, Uriah. Y. *Decolonizing Josiah: Toward a Postcolonial Reading of the Deuteronomistic History*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005.
- _____. *Identity and Loyalty in the David Story: A Postcolonial Reading*, HBM 22. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008.
- Kim, Yoon Kyung. *Subaltern Characters: Agents for Social Change in 2 Kings 7:1-20*. PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2018.
- Kimuhu, Johnson M. *Leviticus: The Priestly Laws and Prohibitions from the Perspective of Ancient Near East and Africa*. New York: Peter Lang, 2008.
- Kittay, Eva Feder. *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Klein, Ralph W. and Thomas Krüger, *1 Chronicles, Hermeneia*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Knierim, Rolf. "Criticism of Literary Features, Form, Tradition, and Redaction." Originally published in 1985. In *Reading the Hebrew Bible for a New Millennium: Form, Concept, and Theological Perspective, Volume 2: Exegetical and Theological Studies*. Edited by Wonil Kim, Deborah Ellens, Michael Floyd, and Marvin A. Sweeney, 1-41. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000:
- _____. "Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered." Originally published in 1973. In *Reading the Hebrew Bible for a New Millennium: Form, Concept, and Theological Perspective, Volume 2: Exegetical and Theological Studies*. Edited by Wonil Kim, Deborah Ellens, Michael Floyd, and Marvin A. Sweeney, 42-71. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000:
- Knight, Douglas A. *The Traditions of Israel*. SBLDiss 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- Knohl, Israel. "The Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School: Sabbath and the Festivals." *HUCA* 58 (1987), 65-117.

- Knoppers, Gary N. *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*. Two volumes, HSM 52-53. Leiden: Brill, 1993-4.
- Ko, Daegon. *The Message of Hope from the True Messenger: A Rhetorical Study of Jeremiah 26-45*. PhD diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2021.
- Koch, Klaus. *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-critical Method*. Translated by S. M. Cupitt. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.
- Koehler, Ludwig., and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. vol. 1. Translated by M. E. J. Richardson. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Koenen, Klaus. *Ethik und Eschatologie im Tritojesajabuch: Eine literarkritische und Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie*. WMANT 62. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.
- Korchin, Paul. "Book Review: Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered: A Cognitive Approach to Poetic Prophecy in Jeremiah 1-24." *Hebrew Studies* 54.1 (2013): 421-425.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966. Originally published in German, 1962.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Edited by Leon S. Roudiez. Translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Kroeger, R. "Legend" In *ISBE*, Revised edition, vol. 3, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986, 100-101.
- Kruse, C. G. "The Servant Songs: Interpretive Trends Since C. R. North." *SBibT* 8 (1978): 3-27.
- Kuan, Jeffrey Kah-Jin. *Neo-Assyrian Historical Inscriptions and Syria-Palestine: Israelite/Judean-Tyrian-Damascene Political and Commercial in the Ninth-Eighth Centuries BCE*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016. Originally published in Hong Kong, 1995.
- Kugel, James C. *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1990.

- Kwon, JiSeong James. *Scribal Culture and Intertextuality: Literary and Historical Relationships Between Job and Deutero-Isaiah*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Laato, Antti. *The Servant of YHWH and Cyrus: A Reinterpretation of the Exilic Messianic Programme in Isaiah 40-55*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1992.
- Lack, Rémi. *La symbolique du livre d'Isaïe: Essai sur l'image littéraire comme élément de structuration*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1973.
- Ladynin, Ivan A. "Iw («Island») and uruPUTU-yAMAN («The City of Greek Buto»): Two Toponyms in the Sources on the Babylonian Invasion into Egypt in 567 B.C." In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Egyptologists*. Edited by Jean-Claude Goyon and C. Cardin, 1071-76. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Laird, Donna. *Negotiating Power in Ezra-Nehemiah*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.
- Lakoff, George. *Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debates*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing, 2004.
- _____. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think, Second Edition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002. The first edition was published in 1996.
- _____. *Political Mind: A Cognitive Scientist's Guide to Your Brain and Its Politics*. New York: Viking, 2009.
- _____. *Thinking Points: Communicating Our American Values and Vision: A Progressive's Handbook*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008.
- _____. "What Orwell Didn't Know About the Brain, the Mind, and Language" In *What Orwell Didn't Know: Propaganda and the New Face of American Politics*. Edited by András Szántó, 67-74. New York: Public Affairs, 2007.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. First published 1980.
- _____. *Philosophy In the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books, 1999.
- Lau, Wolfgang. *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie in Jes 56-66: Eine Untersuchung zu den literarischen Bezügen in den letzten elf Kapiteln des Jesajabuches*, BZAW 225. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994.

- Law, David R. *The Historical-Critical Method: A Guide for the Perplexed*. New York: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Lee, Andrew Yueking. "Reading the Bible as an Asian American: Issues in Asian American Biblical Interpretation" In *Ways of Being, Ways of Reading Asian American Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by Mary F. Foskett and Jeffrey Kah-Jin Kuan, 60-9. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2006.
- Lee, Hee Sung. *The Inheritance of the Servants in Isaiah 40-66: A Textlinguistic Analysis*. PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2007.
- Lee, Kyong-Jin. *The Authority and Authorization of Torah in the Persian Period*, CBET 64. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Lee, Sunghwan. *Who Were The Pharisees Again, Hidden Polemic In Mark 7:1-23*. PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2019.
- Lee, Tae Woong. *The Resistance of Daniel and His Friend: A Postcolonial Satirical Reading of Daniel 1-6 in Its Sociopolitical Context*. PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2017.
- Lee, Yoon-Kyung. "이사야 66 장의 하레딤 연구[A Study on Haredim in Isaiah 66]" *KJOTS* 27.1. (2021): 214-243.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*, Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1991. Originally published in French in 1974.
- Leith, Mary Joan Winn. "Israel among the Nations: The Persian Period." In *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*. Edited by Michael D. Coogan, 276-316. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Leuchter, Mark. "How All Kohanim Became Sons of Aaron" provided by TheTorah.com. <https://www.thetorah.com/article/how-all-kohanim-became-sons-of-aaron>
- Levenson, Jon D. *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. New York: HarperCollins, 1985.
- _____. "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?" *HTR* 68.3-4 (1975): 203-33.
- Liebreich, Leon J. "The Compilation of the Book of Isaiah." *JQR* 46.4 (1956): 259-77.
- _____. "The Compilation of the Book of Isaiah (Continued)." *JQR* 47.2 (1956): 114-38.

- Liew, Tat-siong Benny. *What is Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics? Reading the New Testament*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008.
- Lim, Jie-Hyun, "Victimhood Nationalism in Contested Memories: National Mourning and Global Accountability." In *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*. Edited by Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad, 138-62. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Lim, Sung Uk. "Jonah's Transformation and Transformation of Jonah from the Bakhtinian Perspective of Authoring and Re-authoring." *JSOT* 32.2 (2008): 245-256.
- Lipschitz, Oded. "Demographic Changes in Judah between the 7th and the 5th Centuries BCE." In *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*. Edited by Oded Lipschitz and Joseph Belnkinsopp, 323-76. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Lipschitz, Oded. and Oren Tal, "The Settlement Archaeology of the Province of Judah: A Case Study." In *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* Edited by Oded Lipschitz, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz, 33-52. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- Llewellyn-Jones, Lloyd. "The First Persian Empire: 550-330 BC." In *The Great Empires of the Ancient World*. Edited by Thomas Harrison, 98-121. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2009.
- Lowth, Robert. *Isaiah: A New Translation with Preliminary Dissertation and Notes*. London: E. Henderson, 1778.
- Lundbom, Jack R. *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- _____. *Writing Up Jeremiah: The Prophet and the Book*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2013.
- Lyons, William John. *Canon and Exegesis: Canonical Praxis and the Sodom Narrative*, JSOTSup 352. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Maass, Fritz. "Tritojesaja?" In *Das ferne und nahe Wort Festschrift. Leonhard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres am 31.11.1966 gewidmet*, BZAW 105. Edited by Fritz Maass, 153-163. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1967.
- MacDonald, Nathan. *Priestly Rule: Polemic and Biblical Interpretation in Ezekiel 44*, BZAW 476. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.

- Macintosh, A. A. *Isaiah 21: A Palimpsest*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Magen, Yitzhak. "The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim in Light of the Archaeological Evidence." In *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* Edited by Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz, 157-211. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- _____. "Yitzhak Magen's Response: Dating of the Samaritan Temple on Mt. Gerizim", provided by Biblical Archaeology Society. Uploaded on Sept. 6. 2012.
<https://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/scholars-study/magens-response/>
- Majed, Hasan Saeed. *Islamic Postcolonialism: Islam and Muslim Identities in Four Contemporary British Novels*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.
- Malamat, Abraham. "Josiah's Bid for Armageddon: The Background of the Judean-Egyptian Encounter in 609 B.C." *JANESCU* 5 (1973): 267-279.
- Mandolfo, Carleen. *Daughter Zion Talks Back to the Prophets: A Dialogic Theology of the Book of Lamentations*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.
- Marguerat, Daniel., and Yvan Bourquin, *How to Read Bible Stories: An Introduction to Narrative Criticism*. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1999. Originally published in French, 1998.
- Marks, D. W. *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions, at the West London Synagogue of British Jews*. London: R. Groombridge and Sons, 1851.
- Marti, Karl. *Das Buch Jesaja*, KHAT 10. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1900.
- Masuzawa, Tomoko. *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Mathews, Claire R. (a.k.a. Claire Mathews McGinnis), *Defending Zion Edom's Desolation and Jacob's Restoration (Isaiah 34-35) in Context*. BZAW 236. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995.
- Mayfield, T. D. *Literary Structure and Setting in Ezekiel*. FAT 2.43. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- McCarter, P. Kyle. Jr. "Biblical Detective Work Identifies the Eunuch." *BAR* 28.2 (2002), 46-48.
- McFague, Sally. *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

- McKenzie, John L. *Second Isaiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 20. New York: Doubleday, 1967.
- McKenzie, Steven L. *Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*, VTSup 42. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- Melugin, Roy F. "Figurative speech and the Reading of Isaiah 1 as Scripture" In *New Visions of Isaiah*, JSOTSup 214. Edited by Roy F. Melugin and Marvin A. Sweeney, 282-305. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- _____. "The Book of Isaiah and the Construction of Meaning" In *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. vol. 1. VTSup 70/1. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, 39-55. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. *The Formation of Isaiah 40-55*, BZAW 141. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1976.
- Mendenhall, George E. "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law." *BA* 1 (1954): 25-46.
- Merill, John. "Merill's Letter: Dating of Samaritan Temple on Mt. Gerizim" provided by Biblical Archaeology Society. Uploaded on Sept. 6. 2012.
<https://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/scholars-study/merrills-letter/>
- Meyer, Esias E. "Dating the Priestly Text in the Pre-exilic Period: Some Remarks about Anachronistic Slips and Other Obstacles" *Verbum Eccles.* 31.1.1 (2010) (Online).
- Meyers, Eric M. and Carol L. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 25C. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Michel, Diethelm. "Zur Eigenart Tritojesajas." *ThViat* 10 (1965/6) 213-230.
- Middlemas, Jill. *The Templeless Age: An Introduction to the History, Literature, and Theology of the "Exile."* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.
- Mihailovic, Alexandar. *Corporeal Words: Mikhail Bakhtin's Theology of Discourse*. Evanson: Northwestern University Press, 1997.
- Miller, Jr., Patrick D. "The Divine Council and the Prophetic Call to War." *VT* 18 (1968): 100-107.
- Min, Kyung-Jin. *The Levitical Authorship of Ezra-Nehemiah*, LHBTS 409. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

- Miscall, Peter D. *Isaiah 34-35: A Nightmare/A Dream*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- _____. (a.k.a. Peter D. Quinn-Miscall), *Reading Isaiah: Poetry and Vision*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Morgenstern, Julian. "Further Light from the Book of Isaiah upon the Catastrophe of 485 B.C." *HUCA* 37 (1966): 1-28.
- _____. "Jerusalem - 485 B.C." *HUCA* 27 (1956), 101-179.
- _____. "Jerusalem - 485 B.C. (Concluded)" *HUCA* 31 (1960), 1-29.
- _____. "Jerusalem - 485 B.C. (Continued)." *HUCA* 28 (1957), 15-47.
- _____. "Isaiah 49-55." *HUCA* 35 (1965), 1-35.
- _____. *The Message of Deutero-Isaiah in Its Sequential Unfolding*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1961.
- Moore, Anne. *Moving Beyond Symbol and Myth: Understanding the Kingship of God of the Hebrew Bible Through Metaphor*. New York: Peter Lang, 2009.
- Moore, Megan Bishop. *Philosophy and Practice in Writing a History of Ancient Israel*, LHBOTS 435. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Moore, Megan Bishop, and Brad E. Kelle, *Biblical History and Israel's Past: The Changing Study of the Bible and History*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Moore-Gilbert, Bart. *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics*. London: Verso, 1997.
- Morris, Pam., Editor. *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. London: Edward Arnold, 1994.
- Mouffe, Chantal. "An Agonistic Approach to the Future of Europe." *New Literary History*. 43.4 (2012): 629-40.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. "Die Komposition der deuterojesajanischen Buches" *ZAW* 49 (1931): 87-112.
- _____. "Die Komposition des Jesajabuches, Kap. 1-39." *Acta Orientalia* 11 (1933): 267-292.

- _____. *He That Cometh The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*. Translated by G. W. Anderson. Nashville, TN, Abingdon Press, 1954. The original German edition is *Han som kommer: Messiasforventningen i Det gamle testament og på Jesu tid*. København: G. E. C. Gads forlag, 1951.
- _____. *Jesaja-disiplene*. Oslo : Aschehoug, 1926.
- _____. *Prophecy and Tradition*. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1946.
- _____. *Profeten Jesaja*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1925.
- Moyers, Tony L. *Reading Responsibly: A Basic Guide to Biblical Interpretation*. Lanham: University Press America, 2016.
- Motyer, J. Alec. *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1993.
- Muilenburg, James. "A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style" In *Congress Volume Copenhagen 1953*. VTSup 1. Edited by G.W. Anderson, Aage Bentzen, P.A.H de Boer, Millar Burrows, Henri Cazelles, and Martin Noth, 97-111. Leiden: Brill, 1953.
- _____. "Form Criticism and Beyond." *JBL* 88.1 (1969): 1-18.
- _____. "Isaiah 40-66." *IB* 5. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1956.
- _____. "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle ׀ in the Old Testament." *HUCA* 32 (1961): 135-160.
- Murtonen, Aimo E. "Third Isaiah — Yes or No?: Review Article of Karl Pauritsch, *Die neue Gemeinde: Gott sammelt Ausgestossene und Arme (Jesaia 56-66)*." *Abr-Nahrain* 19 (1980): 20-42.
- Myers, Jacob M. *Ezra-Nehemiah*: AB 14. New York: Doubleday: 1965.
- Na'aman, Nadav. "Dismissing the Myth of a Flood of Israelite Refugees in the Late Eighth Century BCE." *ZAW* 126.1 (2014): 1-14.
- _____. "When and How did Jerusalem Become a Great City? The Rise of Jerusalem as Judah's Premier City in the Eighth-Seventh Century B.C.E." *BASOR* 347 (2007): 21-5.

- Nelson-Jones, Richard (a.k.a. Richard Donald Nelson), *Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981.
- Nelson, Richard Donald. "Realpolitik in Judah (687-609 B.C.E.)" in *Scripture in Context II: More Essays on the Comparative Method*. Edited by W. W. Hallo, J. C. Moyer, and L. G. Perdue, 177-89. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
- Newsom, Carol A. *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Nogalski, James D. *Introduction to the Hebrew Prophets*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2018.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." In *Representations* 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory. (Spring 1989): 7-24.
- Noth, Martin. *The Chronicler's History*, JSOTSup 50. Translated by H. G. M. Williamson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- _____. *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 15. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981. This is a partial excerpt from *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (1943). It was translated by Bernard W. Anderson as *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (1972).
- Nicholson, Ernest W. *Deuteronomy and Tradition: Literary and Historical Problems in the Book of Deuteronomy*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- _____. *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Niethammer, Lutz. "Oral History as a Channel of Communication between Workers and Historians (1982)." In *Memory and history: Essays in Contemporary History*. Peter Lang GmbH, 2012: 63-76.
- Nihan, Christophe. "Ethnicity and Identity in Isaiah 56-66" in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*. Edited by Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming, 67-104. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- _____. *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*. FAT 2.25 Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Niskanen, Paul V. "Who Is Going to Marry You? The Text of Isaiah 62:5." *CBQ* 77.4 (2015) 657-67.

- O'Brien, Julia M. *Priest and Levite in Malachi*. SBLDiss 121. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- O'Brien, M. A., *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- O'Connor, Kathleen M. *Jeremiah: Pain and Promise*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2011.
- _____. *Lamentations and the Tears of the World*. New York: Orbis Books, 2002.
- _____. "Stammering Toward the Unsayable: Old Testament Theology, Trauma Theory, and Genesis." *Int* 70.3 (2016): 301-313.
- Odell, Margaret S. "Ezekiel Saw What He Said He Saw: Genres, Forms, and the Vision of Ezekiel 1" in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi, 162-176. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Oh, Abraham Sung-Ho. *Oh, That You Would Rend the Heavens and Come Down!: The Eschatological Theology of Third Isaiah (Isaiah 56–66)*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2015.
- Olick, Jeffrey K. "Collective Memory: The Two Cultures" *Sociological Theory* 17.3 (1999): 333-348.
- _____. "Genre Memories and Memory Genres: A Dialogical Analysis of May 8, 1945 Commemorations in the Federal Republic of Germany." *ASR* 64 (1999): 381-402.
- Olick, Jeffrey K., Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Olson Denis T. "From Horeb to Nebo: Exile, the Pentateuch, and the Promise of Home in Exodus 2:1-3:6 and Deuteronomy 34:1-12" in *By the Irrigation Canals of Babylon: Approaches to the Study of the Exile*. Edited by John A. Ahn and Jill Middlemas. New York: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Olmstead, A. T. *History of the Persian Empire*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- _____. "II Isaiah and Isaiah, Chapter 35." *AJSL* 53 (1937): 251-53.
- _____. "The Earliest Book of Kings." *AJSL* 31 (1915): 165-214.

- Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. New York: Routledge, 1982.
- Orlinsky, Harry M., and Norman H. Snaith, *Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah*. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Ortony, Andrew. "Metaphor, Language, and Thought." In *Metaphor and Thought*, Second edition, Edited by Andrew Ortony, 1-18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Australia, [first published 1949].
<https://www.planetebook.com/free-ebooks/1984.pdf>
- Park, Cheol Woo. 이사야 56-66 장에 내재된 중앙집중구조와 삼단양식과, 그 특징에 관한 연구 [A Study on the Concentric Structure and the Triadic Pattern of Isaiah 56-66 and their Particularities]. *KJOTS* 13.4 (2007): 70-91.
- _____. *The Triadic Pattern: A Study in the Structure of Isaiah 40-48*. PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 1984.
- Park, Hyun-Ho. *Breaking the Vicious Cycle of Slander, Labeling and Violence: Intergroup Conflict, Recategorization, and Identity Construction in Acts 21:17-23:35*. PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2019.
- Park, Kyung-Chul. *Die Gerechtigkeit Israels und das Heil der Völker: Kultus, Tempel, Eschatologie und Gerechtigkeit in der Endgestalt des Jesajabuches (Jes 56, 1-8; 58, 1-14; 65, 17-66, 24)*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Park, Song-Mi Suzie. *Hezekiah and the Dialogue of Memory*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2015.
- Paul, Shalom M. *Isaiah 40-66: Translation and Commentary*. ECC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Pauritsch, Karl. *Die neue Gemeinde: Gott sammelt Ausgestossene und Arme (Jesaia 56-66)*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.
- Perdue, Leo G. "Yahweh Is King over All the Earth: An Exegesis of Psalm 47." *Restoration Quarterly* 17.3 (1974): 162-84.
- Perry, Menachem., and Meir Sternberg, "The King Through Ironic Eyes: The Narrator's Devices in the Story of David and Bathsheba and Two Excursions on the Theory of the Narrative Text." *Ha-sifrut* 1 (1968): 263-92 (Hebrew).

- Peterson, Allan Rosengren. *The Royal God: Enthronement Festivals in Ancient Israel and Ugarit?*, JSOTSup 259. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Peterson, Brian Neil. *The Authors of the Deuteronomistic History: Locating a Tradition in Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014.
- Peterson, David L. *Late Israelites Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles*, SBLMS. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1977.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941.
- Pieters, Jürgen. "New Historicism: Postmodern Historiography Between Narrativism and Heterology." *History and Theory: Studies in the Philosophy of History* 39.1 (2002): 21-38.
- Pinker, Steven. *The Stuff of Thought: Language as a Window into Human Nature*. New York: Viking, 2007.
- Plöger, Otto. *Theology and Eschatology*. Translated by S. Rudman. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968. Originally published in German in 1959.
- Polan, Gregory J. *In the Ways of Justice toward Salvation: A Rhetorical Analysis of Isaiah 56-59*. New York: Peter Lang, 1986.
- Polzin, Robert. *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History*. New York: Seabury, 1980.
- Pope, Marvin. "Isaiah 34 in Relation to Isaiah 35, 40-66." *JBL* 71 (1951): 235-43.
- Porten, Bezalel., and Ada Yardeni, "Social, Economic, and Onomastic Issues in the Aramaic Ostraca of the Fourth Century B.C.E." in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*. Edited by Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming, 457-488. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Portier-Young, Anthea. *Apocalypse Against Empire Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Procksch, Otto. *Jesaja I*, KAT 9. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1930.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale*, Second edition, Translated b. Svatava Pirkova-Jakobson. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968. Originally published in Russian, 1928.

Provan, Iain W. *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate About the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*, BZAW 172. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1988.

_____. "Ideologies, Literary and Critical: Reflections on Recent Writing on the History of Israel." *JBL* 114.4 (1995): 585-606.

Pummer, Reinhard. *The Samaritans in Flavius Josephus, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism* 129. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Purvis, James D. *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*. HSM 2. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Pyeon, Yohan. *You Have Not Spoken What is Right about Me: Intertextuality and the Book of Job*. New York: Peter Lang, 2003.

Radday, Yehuda T. *The Unity of Isaiah in the Light of Statistical Linguistics*. Hildesheim; Gerstenberg, 1973.

_____. "Two Computerized Statistical-Linguistic Tests concerning the Unity of Isaiah." *JBL* 89.3 (1970): 319-24.

Radner, Karen. *A Short History of Babylon*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2020.

Reddy, Michael J. "The Conduit Metaphor: A Case of Frame Conflict in Our Language about Language." In *Metaphor and Thought*, Second edition, Edited by Andrew Ortony, 164-201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Redford, Donald, B. "The So-Called 'Codification' of Egyptian Law under Darius I." In *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*. Edited by James W. Watts, 135-59. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001.

Rendtorff, Rolf. "Gerhard von Rad's Contribution to Biblical Studies" in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Volume 1. Division A. Edited by Avigdor Shinan, 350–56. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977.

_____. *The Canonical Hebrew Bible: A Theology of the Old Testament*, TBS 7. Translated by David E. Orton. Leiden: Deo, 2005. Originally published in German, 1999.

- _____. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986. Originally published in German, 1983.
- _____. *Canon and Theology: Overtures to an Old Testament Theology, OBT*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1993.
- _____. *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*, JSOTSup. 89. Translated by John H. Scullion. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990. Originally published as *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*, BZAW 17, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1977.
- Richards, Ivor Armstrong. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Richter, Wolfgang. *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft: Entwurf einer alttestamentlichen Literaturtheorie und Methodologie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Rofé, Alexander. "Isaiah 66:1-4: Judaeans in the Persian Period as Viewed by Trito-Isaiah" in *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry*. Edited by Ann Kort and Scott Morschauser, 205-17. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985.
- Rogerson, John William. *Myth in Old Testament Interpretation*. BZAW 134. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1974.
- Rollston, Christopher A. *Writing and Literacy in the World of Ancient Israel: Epigraphic Evidence from the Iron Age*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Rom-Shiloni, Dalit. *Exclusive Inclusivity: Identity Conflicts Between the Exiles and the People who Remained (6th-5th Centuries BCE)*. LHBOTS 543. New York: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Rose, Jenny. *Zoroastrianism: An Introduction*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2011.
- Rose, Wolter H. *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectation in the Early Postexilic Period*. JSOTSup 304. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford University Press, 2009.
- Römer, Thomas Christian. "Elusive Yahwist: A Short History of Research" in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. In SBLSymS 34. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, 9-27. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

- _____. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction*. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Rösel, Martin, "Inscriptional Evidence and the Question of Genre" in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi, 107-121. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Rubenstein, Jeffrey L. *The History of Sukkot in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods*, BJS 302. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2020. Originally published in 1985.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Satanic Verses: A Novel*. New York: Picador, 1988.
- Sabourin S.J., Leopold. *The Psalms: Their Origin and Meaning*, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2010. Originally published in 1974.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*, 1978.
- Saramago, José de Sousa. *The Gospel according to Jesus Christ*. 1994. Originally published in Portuguese in 1991.
- Sanders, James A. "Intertextuality and Dialogue." *BTB* 29.1 (1999): 35-44.
- _____. *Torah and Cannon*, Second edition. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2005.
- Sapir, J. David. "The Anatomy of Metaphor" in *The Social Use of Metaphor*. Edited by J. David Sapir and J. Christopher Crocker. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
- Sasson, Jack M. "Isaiah LXVI 3-4a." *VT* 26.2 (1976): 199-207.
- Schaper, Joachim. "Rereading the Law: Inner-Biblical Exegesis of Divine Oracles in Ezechiel 44 and Isaiah 56." In *Recht und Ethik im Alten Testamen*. Edited by B.M. Levison and E. Otto, 125-144. Münster: LIT-Verlag, 2004.
- _____. "The Jerusalem Temple as an Instrument of the Achaemenid Fiscal Administration." *VT* 45.4 (1995): 528-539.
- Schellenberg, Annette. "An Anti-Prophet among the Prophets? On the Relationship of Jonah to Prophecy." *JSOT* 39.3 (2015): 353-71.
- Schmid, Hans Heinrich. *Der sogenannte Jahwist*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976.

Schmid, Konrad. *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010.

_____. "New Creation Instead of New Exodus: The Innerbiblical Exegesis and Theological Transformations of Isaiah 65:17-25." In *Continuity and Discontinuity: Chronological and Thematic Development in Isaiah 40-66*, edited by Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer and Hans M. Barstad, 180-98. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.

_____. "The Book of Isaiah." In *T&T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Literature, Religion and History of the Old Testament*. Translated by Jennifer Adams-Maßmann, Edited by Jan Christian Gertz, Angelika Berlejung, Konrad Schmid, and Markus Witte, 401-29. New York: T&T Clark, 2012. = *Grundinformation Altes Testament: Eine Einführung in Literatur, Religion und Geschichte des Alten Testaments*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

_____. *The Old Testament: A Literary History*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008 → 2012b. = *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung*. Darmstadt: WBG, 2008.

_____. "Trito-Isaiah (Third Isaiah)." In *Religion Past and Present: Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*, Edited by Hans Dieter Betz, Don S. Browning, Bernd Janowski and Eberhard Jüngel. Leiden: Brill, 2011. It is translated from the fourth edition of RGG. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1877-5888_rpp_SIM_125181.

Schneidau, Herbert N. *Sacred Discontent: The Bible and Western Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

Schniedewind, William M. *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Schramm, Brooks. *The Opponents of Third Isaiah: Reconstructing the Cultic History of the Restoration*, JSOTSup 193. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Schultz, Richard L. "How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter?: Prophetic Inspiration in Recent Evangelical Scholarship" in *Evangelicals and Scripture: Tradition, Authority and Hermeneutics*. Edited by Vincent Bacote, Laura C. Miguélez, and Dennis L. Okholm, 150-170. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2004.

_____. "Isaiah, Isaiahs and Current scholarship" in *Do Historical Matters Matter to Faith?: A Critical Appraisal of Modern and Postmodern Approaches to Scripture*. Edited by James K. Hoffmeier and Dennis R. Magary, 243-61. Wheaton: Crossway, 2012.

- _____. "The Origins and Basic Arguments of the Multi-Author View of the Composition of Isaiah: Where Are We Now and How Did We Get Here?" in *Bind Up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah*. Edited by Daniel Isaac Block and Richard L. Schultz, 7-32. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015.
- _____. "Isaianic Intertextuality and Intertextuality as Composition-Historical Indicators: Methodological Challenges in Determining Literary Influence." In *Bind Up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah*. Edited by Daniel Isaac Block and Richard L. Schultz, 33-64. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015.
- Schüle, Andrea. "Isaiah 56-66." In *The Oxford Handbook of Isaiah*, Edited by Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, 128-144. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Schwartz, Barry. "Collective Memory" in *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. New York: Wiley and Sons, 2017. (Online)
- _____. "Social Change and Collective Memory: The Democratization of George Washington." *ASR* 56 (1991): 221-36.
- _____. "Where There's Smoke, There's Fire: Memory and History." In *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz*. Semeia 78. Edited by Tom Thatcher, 7-40. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.
- Schwartz, Baruch J. "Does Recent Scholarship's Critique of the Documentary Hypothesis Constitute Grounds for Its Rejection?" In *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. FAT 78. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz, 1-16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- _____. *Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Scott, R. B. Y. "The Relation of Isaiah, Chapter 35, to Deutero-Isaiah." *AJSL* 52 (1936): 178-91.
- Scurlock, JoAnn and Richard H. Beal, Editors, *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaaskampf Hypothesis*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Seals, Timothy L. *Daniel's Mystic Third Space: A Postcolonial Mysticism*. PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2019.

- Sehmsdorf, E. "Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte von Jesaja 56—66 (I). (Jes 65 16b-25; 66 1-4; 56 1-8)" *ZAW* 84.4 (1972): 517-562; (II) 562-576.
- Seitz, Christopher R. "On the Question of Divisions Internal to the Book of Isaiah." In *SBLSP*. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering (1993): 260-6.
- _____. *Zion's Final Destiny: The Development of the Book of Isaiah: A Reassessment of Isaiah 36-39*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Sekine, Seizo. *Die Tritojesajanische Sammlung (Jes 56-66) redaktionsgeschichtlich untersucht*, BAZW 175. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1989.
- Sellin, Ernst. "Tritojesaja, Deuterojesaja und das Gottesknechtproblem." *NKZ* 41 (1930): 73–93, 145–73.
- Seow, C. L. *Job 1–21: Interpretation and Commentary*. Illuminations. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Ska, Jean Louis. "The 'History of Israel': Its Emergence as an Independent Discipline." In *The Nineteenth Century—A Century of Modernism and Historicism*, edited by Magne Sæbø, 307–45. vol. 3, part 1 of *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- Skinner, John. *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah: Chapters XL-LXVI, Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1898.
- Smart, James D. *History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40–66*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Smend, Rudolf. "The Law and the Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History." Translated by Peter T. Daniels. In *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*, Edited by Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville, 95-110. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000. Previously published as "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte." In *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Festschrift Gerhard von Rad*, edited by H. W. Wolff, 494–509. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1971.
- Smith, Gary V. "Cyrus of Sennacherib? Historical Issues Involved in the Interpretation of Isaiah 40-55." In *Bind Up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah*. Edited by Daniel Isaac Block and Richard L. Schultz, 175-194. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015.

- _____. *Isaiah 40-66*, NAC 15B. Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing, 2009.
- Smith, Mark S. *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Smith, Morton. *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.
- Smith, Paul Allan. *Rhetoric and Redaction in Trito-Isaiah The Structure, Growth, and Authorship of Isaiah 56-66*, VTSup 62. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. "Reading War and Trauma: Suggestions toward a Social-Psychological Exegesis of Exile and War in Biblical Texts." In *Interpreting Exile: Displacement and Deportation in Biblical and Modern Contexts*. Edited by Brad E. Kelle, Frank Ritchel Ames, and Jacob Wright, 253-274. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2011.
- _____. "Trauma and the Old Testament: Some Problems and Prospects." In *Trauma and Traumatization in Individual and Collective Dimensions: Insights from Biblical Studies and Beyond*. Edited by E. E. Becker, J. Dochhorn and E. K. Holt, 222-242. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2014.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Introduction to the Old Testament: From Its Origins to the Closing of the Alexandrian Canon*, revised edition. London: SCM Press, 1980. Originally published in Italian, 1974. Revised version in 1980.
- Soja, Edward W. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1996.
- Sommer, Benjamin D. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Soncino, Rifat. "Forms of Biblical Law." *ABD* 4. New York: Doubleday, 1992: 252-54.
- _____. *Motive Clauses in Hebrew Law*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Soskice, Janet Martin. *Metaphors and Religious Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Spalinger, Anthony. "Psammetichus: King of Egypt I." *JARCE* 13 (1976): 133-47.
- _____. "The Date of the Death of Gyges and Its Historical Implications." *JAOS* 98.4 (1978): 400-409.

Sperling, David. "The Canon, Text, and Editions." *Encyclopedia Judaica*. Provided by Jewish Virtual Library. https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/history-of-the-bible#THE_CANON_TEXT_AND_EDITIONS.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Wedge* 7-8 (1985): 120-30.

Stackert, Jefferey, *A Prophet Like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Stavarakopoulou, Francesca. *King Manasseh and Child Sacrifice: Biblical Distortions of Historical Realities*. BZAW 338. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004.

Steck, Odil Hannes. "Autor und/oder Redaktor in Jesaja 56-66." in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. vol. 1. VTSup 70/1. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, 219-259. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

_____. "Beobachtungen zur Anlage von Jes 65-66." *Biblische Notizen* 38/39 (1987) 103-116.

_____. *Bereitete Heimkehr: Jesaja 35 als redaktionelle Brücke zwischen dem Ersten und dem Zweiten Jesaja*, Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 1985.

_____. "Die Gottesknechts-Texte und ihre redaktionelle Rezeption im Zweiten Jesaja." In *Gottesknecht und Zion: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Deuterojesaja*, FZAT 4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992: 149-172.

_____. *Studien zu Tritojesaja*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991.

_____. "Tritojesaja im Jesajabuch." In *The Book of Isaiah=Le Livre D'Isaïe: Les Oracles Et Leurs Relectures, Unité Et Complexité de L'Ouvrage*, edited by Jacques Vermeylen, 361-406. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.

Stern, Ephraim. *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, I.1*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University and Israel Exploration Society, 1995.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Stromberg, Jacob. *An Introduction to the Study of Isaiah*. New York: T&T Clark, 2011b.

_____. *Isaiah After Exile: The Author of Third Isaiah as Reader and Redactor of the Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011a.

Sweeney, Marvin A. *I & II Kings: A Commentary*, OTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.

_____. *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*. FAT 45. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

_____. "Form Criticism." In *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry, and Writings*. Edited by Tremper Longman III and Peter Enns. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2010. Credo Reference.

_____. "Form Criticism." In *Method Matters: Essays on the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David L. Petersen*. Edited by Joel M. LeMon and Kent Harold Richards, 17-38. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.

_____. "Form Criticism." In *To Each Its Own Meaning, Revised and Expanded: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes, 58-89. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.

_____. *Isaiah 1-4 and the Post-exilic Understanding of the Isaianic Tradition*. BZAW 171. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1988.

_____. *Isaiah 1-39: With an Introduction to Prophetic Literature*. FOTL 16. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.

_____. *Isaiah 40-66*. FOTL. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016.

_____. *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

_____. *Reading Prophetic Books: Form, Intertextuality, and Reception in Prophetic and Post-Biblical Literature*. FAT 89. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

_____. *Reading the Hebrew Bible After the Shoah: Engaging Holocaust Theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008.

_____. "The Portrayal of Assyria in the Books of Kings" in *The Bible as a Human Witness to Divine Revelation: Hearing the Word of God Through Historically Dissimilar Traditions*. LHBOTS 469. Edited by Randall Heskett and Brian Irwin, 274-84. New York: T&T Clark, 2010.

_____. "The Prophets and the Prophetic Books, Prophetic Circles and Traditions." In *The Twentieth Century—From Modernism to Post-Modernism*, Edited by Magne Sæbø, 500-

30. vol. 3, part 2 of *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- _____. "The Reconceptualization of the Davidic Covenant in Isaiah." In *Studies in the Book of Isaiah. Festschrift Willem A.M. Beuken*, Edited by E. Peters, J. Van Ruiten, and M. Vervenne, 41-61. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- _____. *TANAK: A Theological and Critical Introduction to the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Sweeney, Naoise Mac. *Foundation Myths and Politics in Ancient Ionia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Sweetser, Eve., and Mary Therese DesCamp, "Motivating Biblical Metaphors for God Refining the Cognitive Model." In *Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies*. Edited by Eve Sweetser and Mary Therese DesCamp, 7-24. Berlin: De Gruyter, 201.
- Tate, Marvin E., "The Book of Isaiah in Recent Study." In *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts*, LHBOTS 235. Edited by Paul R. House and John W. Watts, 22-56. New York: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992.
- Thomas, Ryan. "The God Gad" *JAOS* 139.2 (2019): 307-316.
- Thompson, Thomas L. *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1974.
- Tiemeyer, Lena-Sofia. "Book Review: Violence, Otherness and Identity in Isaiah 63:1-6: The Trampling One Coming from Edom." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 63.2 (2018): 507-509.
- _____. "Continuity and Discontinuity in Isaiah 40-66." In *Continuity and Discontinuity: Chronological and Thematic Development in Isaiah 40-66*. Edited by Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer and Hand M. Barstad, 13-40. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.
- _____. *For the Comfort of Zion: The Geographical and Theological Location of Isaiah 40-55*. VTSup 139. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. "Hope and Disappointment: The Judahite Critique of the Exilic Leadership in Isaiah 56-66." In *New Perspectives on Old Testament Prophecy and History: Essays in Honour of Hans M. Barstad*. Edited by Rennifrid I. Thelle, Terje Stordalen and Mervyn E.J. Richardson, 57-73. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

- _____. *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage: Post-Exilic Prophetic Critique of the Priesthood*, FAT 2.19. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- _____. “Will the Prophetic Texts from the Hellenistic Period: Stand Up, Please!” In *Judah Between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule (ca. 400-200 BCE)*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe and Oded Lipschits, 255-279. Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2011.
- Tolley, Kevin. *Deutero- Isaiah's Servant in Light Of Ritual And Temple Imagery*. PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2019.
- Tomasino, Anthony J. “Isaiah 1.1-2.4 and 63-66, and the Composition of the Isaianic Corpus.” *JSOT* 57 (1993): 81-98.
- Torrey, Charles Cutler. “Isaiah 41.” *HTR* 44 (1951): 121-36.
- _____. *The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.
- Trible, Phyllis. *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*, OBT. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.
- _____. *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah*, OTS. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1994.
- _____. *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*, OBT. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Trimm, Charles. “Recent Research on Warfare in the Old Testament” *CBR* 10.2 (2012): 171-216.
- Traon, Jason. *Visions in the Book of Genesis*. PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2022.
- Tsumura, David Toshio. *Creation and Destruction: A Reappraisal of the Chaokampf Theory in the Old Testament*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Tuell, Steven S. “The Priesthood of the ‘Foreigner’: Evidence of Competing Politics in Ezekiel 44:1-14 and Isaiah 56:1-8.” In *Constituting the Community: Studies on the Polity of Ancient Israel in Honor of S. Dean McBride, Jr.* Edited by John T. Strong and Steven S. Tuell, 183-204. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. Third Edition. London: Routledge, 2015.

- Udoekpo, Michael Ufok. *Re-thinking the Day of YHWH and Restoration of Fortunes in the Prophet Zephaniah*. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Vargon, Shmuel. "Isaiah 56:9-57:13: Time of the Prophecy and Identity of the Author. According to Samuel David Luzzatto" *JSQ* 6.3 (1999): 218-33.
- Van de Mieroop, Marc. "Revenge, Assyrian Style" *Past & Present*, 179 (2003): 3-23.
- VanderKam, James C. *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004.
- VanGemenen, Willem A. *Interpreting the Prophetic World: An Introduction to the Prophetic Literature of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books, 1990.
- _____. "Isaiah." In *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: the Gospel Promised*. Edited by Miles V. Van Pelt. Wheaton: Crossway, 2016.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge, Anniversary Edition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009. Originally published in 1998.
- Van Seters, John. *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the Editor in Biblical Criticism*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- _____. *Abraham in History and Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.
- van Wieringen, Archibald L. H. M. *The Implied Reader in Isaiah 6-12*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Veijola, Timo. *Die Ewige Dynastie: David Und Die Entstehung Seiner Dynastie Nach Der Deuteronomistischen Darstellung*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975.
- _____. *Das Konigtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977.
- Vermeulen, Jacques. *Du Prophète Isaïe à L'Apocalyptique: Isaïe, I-XXXV, Miroir d'un Demi-Millénaire d'expérience Religieuse en Israël*, vol. 2. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1978.
- Volf, Miroslav. *The End of Memory: Remembering Rightly in a Violent World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Volz, Paul. *Jesaia II*, KAT 9/2. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1932.

- von Rad, Gerhard. *Holy War in Ancient Israel*. Translated by Marva J. Dawn. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.
- _____. *Old Testament Theology*, vol.1. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1962. Originally published in German, 1957.
- _____. "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch." In *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Translated by E. W. Trueman Dicken, 1-78. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966. Originally published in 1938.
- Walton, John H., and D. Brent Sandy. *The Lost World of Scripture: Ancient Literary Culture and Biblical Authority*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013.
- Watts, James W. "Scripturalization and the Aaronide Dynasties." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 13.6 (2013): 1-15.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 1-33*, WBC 24. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985.
- _____. *Isaiah 34-66*, WBC 25. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Weinberg, Joel. *The Citizen-Temple Community*, JSOTSup 151. Translated by Daniel L. Smith-Christopher. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1972.
- _____. "The Origin of the Apodictic Law: An Overlooked Source." *VT* 23.1 (1973): 63-75.
- Weippert, Helga. "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher." *Bib* 53.3 (1972), 301-339.
- Weiser, Artur. *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. New York: Association Press, 1961. Translated from the fourth edition in German, 1957.
- _____. *The Psalms: A Commentary*, OTL. Translated by Herbert Hartwell. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962. Translation of the fourth edition in German, 1955.
- Weiss, Andrea L. *Figurative Language in Biblical Prose Narrative: Metaphor in the Book of Samuel*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Translated by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies. New York: Meridian Books, 1957. Originally published in 1878.
- Wertsch, James V. "Collective Memory." In *Memory in Mind and Culture*. Edited by P. Boyer and J. V. Wertsch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- _____. *Voices of the Mind: Sociocultural Approach to Mediated Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Westbrook, Raymond. "What Is the Covenant Code?" In *Theory and Method in Biblical and Cuneiform Law: Revision, Interpolation, and Development*. JSOTSup 181. Edited by Bernard M. Levinson, 15-36. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1994.
- Westermann, Claus. *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*. Translated by Hugh Clayton White. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1967. Original German edition is *Grundformen Prophetischer Rede* in 1964.
- _____. *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*, OTL. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969. Originally published in German, 1966.
- Wildberger, Hans. *Isaiah 28-39, Continental Commentary*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002. Originally published in German, 1982.
- _____. "The Theory of a Josianic Edition of the First Part of the Book of Isaiah: A Critical Examination." In *Studies in Isaiah: History, Theology and Reception*. LHBOTS 654. Edited by Tommy Wasserman, Greger Andersson and David Willgren, 3-21. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017.
- Williams, Ronald J. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax, Third Edition*. Revised and Expanded by John C. Beckman. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *Ezra-Nehemiah*. WBC 16. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985.
- _____. "Judah and the Jews." In *Achaemenid History. XI. Studies in Persian History: Essays in Memory of David M. Lewis*. Edited by Amélie Kuhrt and Maria Brosius, 145-63. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut van Het Nabije Oosten, 1998.
- _____. *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

- Willey, Patricia Tull (a.k.a Patricia K. Tull). *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*. SBLDiss 161. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1997.
- Wilson, Robert R. "Prophecy and Ecstasy: A Reexamination" *JBL* 98.3 (1979): 321-337.
- _____. *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Wimsatt, William Kurtz, and Monroe C. Beardsley. "Intentional Fallacy." *The Sewanee Review* 54.3 (1946), 468-488.
- Wolf, Herbert M. *Interpreting Isaiah: The Suffering and Glory of the Messiah*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1985.
- Woo, Taek-Joo and Won-Je Jung, "제 3 이사야서의 배경에서 본 이사야 6 장의 내러티브 비평 [Narrative Critical Reading of Isaiah 6 in a Socio-Historical Context of Third Isaiah (Chs. 56-66)]" *TF* 65 (2011), 121-145.
- Whybray, R. N. *Isaiah 40-66*, NCBC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Yamauchi, Edwin M. *Persia and the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1990.
- Yang, Inchol. *Ezekiel's Prophecies under the Influence of Mesopotamian Literature: Hidden Transcripts against Empire*. PhD diss., Claremont School of Theology, 2019.
- _____. "Understanding Isa 56:1-8 in Light of the Sabbath Text in Neh 13:15-22." *KJCS* 117 (2020): 47-71.
- Yee, Gale. A., Editor. *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. Second edition. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007.
- _____. "Of Foreigners and Eunuchs: An Asian American Reading of Isa. 56:1-8." In *T&T Clark Handbook of Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics*. Edited by Uriah Y. Kim and Seung Ai Yang, 261-72. New York: T&T Clark, 2019.
- _____. "Yin/Yang Is Not Me: An Exploration into an Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics." In *Ways of Being, Ways of Reading Asian American Biblical Interpretation*, Edited by Mary F. Foskett and Jeffrey Kah-Jin Kuan, 152-163. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2006.
- Yoon, Jong-pil. "에드워드 사이드 (Edward Said) 이후의 오리엔탈리즘 연구 동향과 그 세계사 교육적 함의" [An analysis of the historical studies on Orientalism after Edward

Said and their implications for world history teaching]. *The Western History Review* 145 (2020): 77-123.

Young, Edward J. "Isaiah 34 and Its Position in the Prophecy." *WTJ* 27 (1965): 93-114.

_____. *Studies in Isaiah*. London: Tyndale Press, 1954.

_____. *The Book of Isaiah*. vol. 1-3. NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1965-1972.

Young, Ian, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensverd. *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. Volume 2. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Zimmerli, Walther. "Zur Sprache Tritojesaja." In *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, 217-33. München: C. Kaiser, 1963. Originally published in *Schweizerische theologische Umschau* 20 (1950): 110-22.